DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 336 FL 001 035

By-Else, Gerald F., Ed.
Report of the Colloquium on the Classics in Education, 1965.
American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y.
Pub Date Jan 66
Note-72p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.70
Descriptors-Ancient History, *Classical Languages, *Classical Literature, *Conference Reports, Foreign Countries, Grammar, Greek, History Instruction, *International Programs, Language Instruction, Language Programs, Latin, Teaching Methods

This is the report of an international meeting on the Classics, conducted August 1965 in London, England. Resolutions adopted by the Colloquium, minutes of group sessions, papers, and national reports on the state of classical education are presented. Group sessions discuss the teaching of classical languages, classical literatures, and ancient history and civilization. Special papers presented on some aspects of these topics include David H. Kelly's "Grammar and Methodology," Kenneth Quinn's "The Nature of Literary Documents," and H.W. Pleket's "The Teaching of Ancient History." National reports (including several in French and one in Italian) discuss the current state of classical education in Australia and New Zealand, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the United States. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT OF THE

COLLOQUIUM ON THE CLASSICS IN EDUCATION

1965

FL 001 035

ED023336

REPORT OF THE

COLLOQUIUM ON THE CLASSICS IN EDUCATION

1965

edited by

GERALD F. ELSE

FL 001 035

for the

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Published January 1966

Additional copies of this report can be obtained from Professor Michael C. J. Putnam, Department of Classics, Brown University, Providence 12, Rhode Island, U.S.A., as long as the supply lasts.

FOREWORD

What are the present state and future prospects of classical education, and of the Classics in education, in the world of the 1960's? The answers vary enormously from one country and one region to another. The chief nations of Western Europe (including, in this context, the United States) have a long humanistic tradition in which the history and literature of Greece and Rome still occupy a recognized place; indeed, until not many years ago, the highest place. In all of those same lands, however, the tradition has been attacked, or at least subjected to close scrutiny, and even its validity has been questioned by various critics for various reasons over varying periods of time since the beginning of the century. In some Western European countries classicists are now reviewing, restating, and republishing the values of their tradition in modern terms; in others, the recency of competition from other disciplines with other goals has not yet led to creative self-examination and re-evaluation. Meanwhile the modern world embraces at least two whole continents, Asia and Africa, which have at best only slender ties with the Greek and Roman classics; and in a country like Brazil (see below, p. 43) the whole relationship of classical education to modern political and intellectual goals appears, to say the least, problematical. Above all, massive change is now invading every branch of education in every part of the globe, including — even — the Classics.

Actually no one knows what the total facts are concerning the present status of the Classics in education. No institution, office, or research project exists anywhere which is in possession of them or equipped to learn them. It was in order to make a beginning, to initiate a world-wide conversation on these matters which are of concern to every classicist, that the Colloquium on the Classics in Education (full title, Colloquium on the Present State and Future Prospects of the Classics in Education) was formed. The group first met during the Fourth International Congress of Classical Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., August 24–29, 1964. Among those who shared the idea and the labor which led to the establishment of the Colloquium were Whitney J. Oates, Howard Comfort, Sir Ronald Syme, and, *praeter omnes laudandus,* T. R. S. Broughton. The persons invited to take part in the sessions were younger scholars, between 30 and 40 years of age approximately, in the fields of Classics and Ancient History. Three sessions, two formal

and one informal, were held during the Congress, the last one on the campus and at the invitation of Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania. A total of 33 persons, divided almost equally between Americans (U. S. A.) and representatives of 14 other countries, attended one or more of these sessions. At that time the Colloquium did not attempt to publish *acta*. It did reach informal agreement, embodied in an unpublished "Consensus of the Meeting," that active steps should be taken to teach the classical languages more rapidly and efficiently and to provide new texts and materials for the teaching of classical literature and civilization. Above all, the Colloquium established new contacts and friendships among its members. After the Congress they kept in touch with one another through a newsletter subsidized by Haverford College and edited by one of its faculty, William C. Scott, as Corresponding Secretary.

The first meeting of the Colloquium was made possible by travel subventions from the American Council of Learned Societies within the framework of the Fourth International Congress of Classical Studies. It seemed to some of us that the momentum so gained should not be lost. Thanks chiefly to the diplomacy of Professor Oates, the ACLS subsequently compounded its generosity by pledging travel and subsistence costs for a second meeting during the summer of 1965, and costs of publication of this report. With corresponding generosity the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London, through its Director, Professor R. P. Winnington-Ingram, placed its facilities at the disposal of the Colloquium and our meeting was held in the rooms of the Institute at 31–34 Gordon Square in London on 19–22 August 1965. A total of 25 members attended, representing thirteen countries. (For the list of members see pp. 62–66). Administrative responsibility for the meeting, and for this report, was borne by a committee of the American Philological Association consisting of Howard Comfort, Whitney J. Oates, and the undersigned as Chairman; disbursement of funds was made through the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, Charles Henderson, Jr.

The meeting began with "plenary" sessions at which Brother Kelly and Messrs. Quinn and Pleket presented special papers on the teaching of the classical languages, classical literature, and ancient history and civilization. The Colloquium then broke up into three groups to discuss these questions in greater detail; at the end it reassembled in plenary session to hear reports from the groups and to adopt a series of resolutions. For the record of the special sessions we are indebted to the chairmen (Messrs. Janson, Hanson, and Chambers respectively) and particularly to the recorders (Kelly, Scott, and Connor) of the three groups.

It was intended from the beginning that the Colloquium would

publish a report of its second meeting. That report now lies before the reader, in five parts:

1) The *resolutions* of the Colloquium;
2) Brief *minutes* of the discussions in the three groups;
3) The three *special papers;*
4) A series of very brief *reports* by the members *on the state of classical education* in their respective countries;
5) The roster of *members of the Colloquium.*

It may be asked what authority this group of 30-odd members has to speak for classical education around the globe. The answer is, None. The Colloquium is not an arm or organ of any official body. Its members are individuals who speak for themselves. That is, in fact, its strength and its chief interest. Meanwhile there is no other group which has even attempted a world-wide view of the present situation of classical education. The perceptive reader will find in our resolutions and in the record of our discussions evidence of a deep concern for the survival and future prosperity of classical studies, seen in global perspective. He will, I think, be struck by the similarity of the problems that are now presenting themselves in many places, and by the amount of agreement that was reached by the Colloquium. Eminently worth perusal, among these *acta,* are the reports of the members on the present state of classical education in their respective countries. There is matter here for meditation and, in not a few cases, action.

The Colloquium does not plan to meet again in the immediate future. Instead, its members have pledged themselves to work in their respective countries and parts of the world for the realization of the aims expressed in our resolutions. We hope to meet again at the Fifth International Congress of Classical Studies to be held at Bonn, Germany, in August 1969. Meanwhile, to those who are of like mind with us we issue an invitation to declare their solidarity, and eventually to join us in constructive activity in the common cause. Such messages should be addressed to the chairman of the Interim Committee of the Colloquium, Prof. Michael C. J. Putnam (address below, p. 65).

Gerald F. Else
Chairman of the Colloquium

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. The Resolutions of the Colloquium 1

II. Minutes of the Group Sessions

1. On Teaching the Classical Languages 2
2. On Teaching the Classical Literatures 4
3. On Teaching Ancient History and Civilization . . 8

III. The Three Special Papers

1. Bro. David H. Kelly: "Grammar and Methodology" . 10
2. Kenneth Quinn: "The Nature of Literary Documents" . 15
3. H. W. Pleket: "The Teaching of Ancient History" . . 30

IV. The Present State of Classical Education

Australia and New Zealand 42
Brazil 43
Czechoslovakia 44
France 46
Germany 48
Ghana 50
Great Britain 51
Greece 52
Italy 53
Japan 54
The Netherlands 55
Spain 56
Sweden 57
The United States:
East 58
West 59

V. Roster: The Members of the Colloquium 62

I. THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE COLLOQUIUM

(adopted 22 August 1965)

1. The goal of the elementary course is the acquisition of a reading knowledge of Greek and Latin. We urge experimentation with new and more efficient techniques — textbooks and teaching materials — to attain this goal as rapidly as possible.

2. Classics professors in the universities should contribute to the production of modern school and college texts and commentaries inculcating the best possible critical methods.

3. Good critical studies of classical authors (including reprints of published articles) need to be made available to teachers and students on the lower levels.

4. Given the difficulties of Greek and Latin texts and the relatively short time available for their study, we recommend the judicious use of translations, both as aids in interpreting texts and as an indispensable means for covering a wider range of classical literature. Professional classicists should actively assist in the organization and teaching of courses of classical literature in translation.

5. Since there exists an increasing need for accelerated courses in the classical languages for intelligent and highly motivated students who begin these studies in colleges and universities, we urge that such courses be offered — especially during vacation periods.

6. Because communication between teachers of Greek and Latin in secondary schools and scholars in the universities has been inadequate or non-existent in the past, we urge an increased effort to improve this situation. We recommend the multiplication of special institutes to foster an interchange of experiences, insights, and techniques.

7. Since a full range of photographic material illustrating ancient history and archaeology is not at present easily accessible, we recommend the establishment of a central photographic library which would speedily and inexpensively make slides and prints available for teaching and study. The Fototeca di Architettura Antica in Rome, under the direction of Mr. Ernest Nash, already provides a nucleus which might, if proper assistance were supplied, be expanded to include a wider range of materials and services.

8. Because of the need for disseminating information about the availability of maps, casts and reproductions of antiquities, and various written aids to the study of the ancient world, we call for the preparation of a selective annual bibliography of such material.

9. An exchange of study collections illustrating the cultures of various nations would greatly further international understanding and good relations. We suggest that ways be explored to encourage Mediterranean countries to make collections of ancient potsherds and other minor antiquities available for the teaching of ancient history and archaeology.

10. We recommend a series of pamphlets to deal with various phases of the ancient world:

a. Ancient monuments or archaeological sites, with a large number of views and minimal commentary;
b. Ancient battlefields, armor, and private antiquities;
c. Problems or topics in ancient history, with emphasis on a clear presentation of the ancient evidence, and including, where appropriate, new translations, commentaries, illustrative material, and modern articles;
d. The achievements of recent scholarship on topics like numismatics, ancient pottery, and historical eras.

All these pamphlets should be prepared by competent scholars who would receive some modest compensation for their work, and they should be published in paper-back editions at a low price.

II. MINUTES OF THE GROUP SESSIONS

1. ON TEACHING THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

Members: Gil; Janson (chairman); Kagan; Kelly (recorder); Livadaras; Marzullo; Tobari.

The Problem

Lively discussion arose as a result of an opening statement which denied that Greek and Latin are languages in the same sense as modern languages. In this debate some stressed the dissimilarities between the study of documents written in Greek and Latin and the study of texts in modern languages, while others emphasized the similarities. The arguments on both sides did give the group a clearer appreciation of the special problems involved in studying texts written in a dead language. It is evident that Latin and Greek at any given period were languages used in the same way and for the same purposes as any modern language, but nevertheless our goal is not to become speakers of those languages but to comprehend literary texts of a high order of complexity.

Methodology in the Elementary Course

All agreed that there will continue to be considerable variations

in pronunciation from one country to another and that it would be unrealistic to attempt to impose one pronunciation upon all countries. On the central problem of elementary methodology, i.e., the teaching of grammar, there was again considerable disagreement. The so-called aural-oral or habit-acquisition method was explained and endorsed by some members, but many in the group remained opposed to the new methodology, preferring the traditional grammatical-analysis approach in combination with the translation of simple sentences and a transition to reading authentic but easy texts at an early stage.

It was, however, agreed by all that the methods and materials used in the elementary course would vary necessarily with the age and interests of the students. This last consideration becomes important in view of the fact that elementary courses must now and henceforth be offered with greater frequency to adult students. Many of the existing textbooks are unsuited to intellectually mature students.

The discussion then moved to more specific problems of methodology. It was pointed out by some that there are stylistic features in Latin and Greek, e.g., *dolor amissae Caeciliae,* which are crucial to the understanding of many literary texts but too often are not introduced to the pupils in the early part of the course. The remark pointed up the necessity of selecting well-organized beginning textbooks .

All agreed that syntax should not be taught in isolation; in the Classics course the study of syntax is not an end in itself as it would be in a linguistics course, but is rather an indispensable means for understanding the literary documents.

Some favored the occasional use of historical and comparative grammar in teaching the languages even at the elementary level, e.g., introducing the concept of ablaut or vowel gradation when studying the Greek verb. There were several warnings, however, that this could easily be overdone and made into just another difficulty instead of a help.

The discussion of general methodology ended with agreement on the utility, in fact the necessity, of continuing experimentation to discover techniques for improving the admittedly poor results of much elementary teaching.

Translation

No agreement was reached on the pedagogical value of translation from Greek and Latin. Some considered it a waste of time while others insisted that it was an indispensable tool that had to be used regularly. No one in the group defended the practice of translation from the vernacular into Greek and Latin at the elementary level.[1]

[1] At the final plenary session, however, other members of the Colloquium strongly defended the use of prose composition even at the elementary level.

Printed translations of classical texts were recommended for general use, both as helps for students worikng with difficult texts and as one of the best ways of acquainting the class with a wider range of classical literature.

2. ON TEACHING THE CLASSICAL LITERATURES

Members: Anderson; Hanson (chairman); Lewis; Putnam; Quinn; Scott (recorder).

The group discussed the study of ancient literature under three headings: texts, curriculum, and the use of translations.

Texts and commentaries. Many commentaries are not interesting or pertinent to students. There is a need for two types of text, one for the scholar or graduate student and another for the younger person who is learning the language as something to be read for pleasure. Contemporary philology seems to satisfy the desires of the first group adequately, but the beginner is often overwhelmed and repelled by lengthy and detailed commentary. There is a need for "teaching texts" which will stimulate the student to consider issues significant to him and invite him to enter into debate on basic problems in an author.

The target of this type of text would be the beginner, but also his teacher, who may have an interest in various authors but does not possess the training of a professional scholar and needs help to prepare himself adequately for entering new fields.

Our practical advice can be considered under six headings:

1. Textual Problems. There are many textual problems in ancient texts which are not essential for a basic understanding of the author. These might well be ignored in a teaching edition. We strongly recommend that textual discussion be confined to readings which are major conjectures by the editor or previous editors, passages which radically alter the interpretation of the entire work, and matters on which there is serious divergence among scholars. A statement of purpose in the introduction would excuse the editor for skipping over what others may consider indispensable points. Such selectivity is justified in an edition which is not intended for the delectation of the finished scholar.

2. Method of Argumentation. While no scholar should ignore the achievements of philology, we favor the use of literary and aesthetic criteria in arguing various sides of a case. This inevitably will lessen the pure objectivity of the commentary, but may help the student who has not had a full training in philology to enter into the discussion with those resources which he can command at the moment.

3. The Introduction. The introduction should present succinctly and palatably matters of general interest concerning the text: grammatical peculiarities of the author, metrics, general background of the work, brief history of the text, etc.

4. Aids to Proper Translation. The prime goal of the commentary is to aid the student in reading and/or translating the text fully and accurately. To achieve this goal, comments on language, style, sound, and special techniques of the author should be included.

5. Bibliography. We recommend the inclusion of a few references to useful and available articles of general interest. These should be articles which stimulate the interest of a beginning student and also aid a teacher who is approaching an unfamiliar subject.

6. Critical Comment. It is our hope that the commentator will include judgments of his own on the worth of his author. These must not be dictatorial statements, but should be phrased as provocative remarks to which readers may take exception.

We favor a commentary that is bright and brief enough to hold a student's interest and stimulate thought. A teaching text need not attack every philological problem but should be limited to those which can be understood and appreciated by a learner. Such a text should not be philologically unsound; a competent editor can pick points of dispute which are significant to a beginning student. Such a text should also not be banal; a competent editor can write for a respectable level of understanding to which a beginner is expected to grow.

To increase the number of such texts, we make the following proposals:

1. Old editions should not be republished unless they fulfil the aims which we have set forth.

2. School teachers, as the potential users of such books, should be encouraged to edit texts. University people could help them select and edit materials for inclusion.

3. All efforts should be made to interest younger scholars in writing commentaries, and more praise and credit should be given to the editor of a successful teaching text.

4. There should be some way to introduce publishers who want an edition of an author to younger scholars and school teachers who are willing to produce such a text.

Curriculum. We find fault with the traditional sequence of authors and texts. These are the principles which underlie our thoughts on a new curriculum:

1. Reading matter must relate to the immediate and natural experience of the student.

2. There should be some core of intellectual challenge or literary worth in any passage used. The pure recording of anecdote is no way to attract students to ancient texts.

3. The original language may be adapted or altered slightly to enable students to come into contact with ancient works at the earliest possible moment.

4. The curriculum must leave room for the teacher to vary the passages which he teaches from year to year.

Hence we recommend the following action:

1. New elementary ("grammar") books. There is a need for elementary books which present grammar quickly and without needless complication. The beginning chapters should contain enough basic matter so that the reading of a simple text can be started shortly after the beginning of the course. These books should present grammar and vocabulary which are common to a wide variety of authors, so that the teacher is not tightly restricted in choosing the first text for reading.

2. New texts. A book of selections ought to be prepared which could be assigned when the beginner has mastered a minimum of grammar. This book should contain material of increasing difficulty. It would take the student from the early stages of grammar up to the reading of the first complete text. Such selections should be as near as possible to the original language. They ought to spur some independent thinking about content. Perhaps they could focus on some theme or historical event; different ancient accounts of the same event could well stir thought on motives of the author and the personality he portrays. Also new editions of authors like Plautus, Terence, Catullus, and Cicero must be prepared. These should be complete texts with challenging commentary. They should show the student the type of work which he will be expected to do in handling a text.

We suggest the following curriculum for Latin:

First year — learning grammar quickly and reading of selections as early in the year as possible; this would be followed by reading a play of Plautus.

Second year — Catullus and Cicero, with enough historical background to compare the two meaningfully.

After this — Vergil, treated as a poet. The whole of the *Aeneid* should be read in translation. Then selected and varied parts can be read in the original.

A considerable problem remains in inspiring teachers to inform themselves well enough to move competently beyond grammar in their presentation of the subject. We recommend that university people take an active interest in encouraging high school teachers in the following ways:

1. Collecting useful and significant articles which could be cheaply reproduced in pamphlet form. There could, for example, be one such pamphlet on each basic author.

2. Encouraging seminars for teachers during vacation time. Educational groups and governments should be asked to support such efforts.

3. Addressing meetings of school teachers and getting to know them and their problems.

4. Influencing examination boards to change their examinations. There should be some general questions concerning the authors and their works, going beyond a simple knowledge of grammar.

The Use of Translations. There are fears of allowing readers to become acquainted with the ancient world through translations. The student, it is said, will have no close contact with the text and no real knowledge of the author. The assignments will be long, and all that will be gained by reading an ancient text so rapidly and in bulk is general impressions. Finally, there are some texts which cannot be effectively taught through translation.

It seems to us that these fears are far outweighed by the value of using translations — value to the Classics and value to readers:

1. Critical Ability. The length of assignments in translation courses is such that a student who is preparing a paper must refer to the words of the author and think the problems through for himself, rather than fall back on the use of secondary material. This should improve the student's ability to read and think for himself.

2. Enlightenment in a Cloudy Area. The translation course generally has a fairly wide scope and allows students to fill in their knowledge of the ancient world in a very short time. If they were forced to do all this reading in the original languages, a whole college curriculum would be insufficient. In addition, when large numbers of students are enrolled in such courses the Classics will not seem so alien. Thucydides might become a household word.

3. Focus on Content. The use of translations will encourage breadth and understanding on the part of students who would previously have excelled in Classics because of their control of the grammar. It will promote deeper understanding for the philologist and for the general reader.

4. New Way of Teaching. The translation course will destroy the idea that it is dishonest to have anything other than an analytical knowledge of an ancient work. This may increase the classicist's own enjoyment in studying his text and bring new readers to ancient authors.

5. Values to the Classics. Classicists can protect themselves from destructive or misleading teaching which may result if subjects are taught

by instructors in other fields who have no training in the classical languages. Secondly, teachers of translation courses generally feel that they have a greater grasp of their subject after teaching such a course. Classics in translation have helped lead students to study ancient authors in the original and have thus buttressed our dwindling numbers. Finally, the translation course offers teachers a chance to show students a work as the author intended it — an immediate experience which can be read or heard quickly.

We therefore recommend that translation courses be continued or instituted as a part of the Classics Department's offerings, and that translations also be used in classes in the original languages.

To implement this we propose an increase in good and accurate translations in all languages. We also favor the publication of good general essays which are informative to the reader of translations.

3. ON TEACHING ANCIENT HISTORY AND CIVILIZATION

Members: Bezerra de Meneses; Bowersock; Chambers (chairman); Connor (recorder); Edmonson; Holloway; Kwapong; LeGall; Pleket; Vidman.

In his opening remarks the chairman observed that the group might appropriately concern itself both with more theoretical questions relating to the study of ancient history, for example its value, nature and justification, and with more practical questions, in particular with ways in which the teaching of ancient history might be improved in the several countries represented. The discussions which followed in this and in the later sessions concerned both divisions mentioned by the chairman, and will here be summarized under these two headings:

THEORETICAL

Many of the theoretical questions which arose grew out of Mr. Pleket's paper which is published elsewhere in these proceedings. His contention, for example, that teachers of ancient history should not content themselves with a mere survey of the periods they cover, but should concentrate on particular episodes or circumstances that seem to offer a parallel to contemporary events, drew repeated and largely favorable comment. It was quickly agreed that students must be acquainted with the chronological background to the events they study, and that the instructor must take care to avoid any distortion or imprecision in his treatment. On the other hand many members stressed their feeling that a survey of the events in a given period was often a shallow and unengaging means of presentation.

The second point of more theoretical interest grew in part out of the first. Mr. Kwapong pointed out that in Africa and many other parts of the world it is very difficult to justify the study of the history of ancient Greece and Rome with the traditional slogans frequently heard in Europe and America, especially those that defend classical history as the study of "the origins of our own society" or "the fountainhead of Western civilization," etc. He remarked that in Africa such slogans had little relevance and less appeal. These comments led to a discussion of the value of ancient history that was fruitful and stimulating, and still in eager progress when time forced the adjournment of the last committee session. Although no consensus was reached in these discussions, many other justifications for the study of classical history were put forward, including the unique nature of its documentation.

PRACTICAL

All the sessions of the group brought exchanges of information about the methods and procedures used in the teaching of classical history in the various countries represented; these, in turn, led to many suggestions for improvements in teaching. Wide agreement appeared on the need for more attention to the practical needs of classroom teachers of ancient history, both in the schools and in the universities. Several specific suggestions resulted, which can be summarized under two headings:

1. *Proposals to make existing teaching materials more widely or more easily available.* It was felt that an annual bibliography of existing maps, casts of sculpture, and slides of ancient works of art would help many teachers find material that otherwise might go unnoticed. Similarly, bibliographical surveys of subjects relating to ancient history and society, perhaps resembling the pamphlet on ancient history published by the American Historical Association, would be valuable to teachers. Small collections of potsherds would be of great use in teaching archaeology and ancient history, especially in lands where there are no classical sites.

2. *Proposals for preparing new materials or supplementing or expanding existing materials.* A central clearing house of slides or prints of ancient art would help overcome a difficulty that several members of the Colloquium had experienced in trying to obtain, quickly and inexpensively, a good photograph of an ancient work of art. The nucleus of such a collection is perhaps available in the Architectural Fototeca in Rome, but the inclusion of ancient painting and sculpture would be desirable. Pamphlets comprising a series of views of a single ancient monument would be another useful addition. Since these need not, in-

deed should not, have more than a minimal commentary, the obstacles to international sale could easily be surmounted. Another series of inexpensive booklets incorporating fresh translations of ancient historical sources and, where appropriate, commentaries, modern articles, illustrative material, etc., is another possible contribution to improving the teaching of the subject.

Most of these proposals have been incorporated in resolutions which were finally adopted by the Colloquium as a whole.

III. THE THREE SPECIAL PAPERS

1. GRAMMAR AND METHODOLOGY

Brother David Hilary Kelly

To their conservatively oriented colleagues in the classical field, the advocates of audio-lingual teaching methods sometimes appear as misguided enthusiasts eager to reap an abundant harvest without first plowing the land and planting seed. The traditionalist feels intuitively that any teacher is deluded who believes that students can acquire mastery over a new language without coming to grips with its grammar. He is wont to object, in discussions of new methodology, that there is a vast difference between the more or less mature high school or college student and the child reared in a Latin-speaking environment some two thousand years ago. Children necessarily approach their future language with a linguistic *tabula rasa;* furthermore they must learn it to communicate with the world in which they find themselves. They have all the time they need to devote to this task; in fact one could almost say that learning his language is the chief occupation of the pre-school child. These conditions, needless to say, do not obtain in the life of the modern student in school or college. Clearly the job must be done in far less time, and the motivation involved can hardly equal that of the child who needed Latin in order to survive. But just as important, say the traditionalists, the student of today already controls his own language and, we hope, understands its grammar. Therefore why not use his native language when attempting to teach a second language? When the student learns the new grammatical structures and is given sufficient vocabulary, he will be able to read with understanding texts written in the new language. The proof that he really does understand what he reads will lie in his ability to translate from the new language back into his native language. Such is the theory which lies behind the traditional methodology of grammatical analysis and translation. How is it possible to find fault with this approach to language learning, especially for the classical languages? The student is treated as a

mature individual capable of insight into the grammatical forms and rules of the new language. As soon as possible he is introduced to significant literature. Hopefully this serves not merely as a *corpus vile* for grammatical dissection but, more importantly, to introduce the student to the cultural values of antiquity. There is no doubt that this method can produce good results; most if not all classical scholars in the world oday received their training along these lines. Why then a clamor for new methods; is it a result simply of a loss of nerve due to a decline in the number of students enrolling in the Classics?

It seems to me that more is involved. Two seemingly irreconcilable theories of language learning meet head-on in this debate. In opposition to the traditionalist position described above, the aural-oral theoreticians emphasize language learning as the acquisition of a skill. Almost a *cliché* among them nowadays would be the remark that language learning is habit forming, not puzzle solving. In their methodologies, therefore, little if any time is devoted to theoretical explanations of the grammar, and especially to the terminological apparatus that has always accompanied such presentations; instead, classroom time is given over to massive drills, the so-called pattern-practice drills, aimed at giving the student control over the new patterns. The very fact mentioned above, that the mature student knows his own language so well, is now recognized as the greatest obstacle to his mastering a new language, since he must necessarily construct for himself a completely different way of talking about the world, and at each step in the process there will be interference from the native patterns to which he has grown so accustomed that all others seem irrational if not downright perverse.

Pattern drill becomes therefore indispensable to the new methodology. All his speaking life the student has distinguished, say, subjects from objects (not that he is aware of the terms) by the grammatical device of word position. In reading Latin this signal must be disregarded and attention directed to the case markers. A technical presentation of this structural difference, and five or ten sample sentences to be translated from Latin into English, and vice versa, cannot suffice to break through the linguistic habits of a lifetime. A good methodology requires a great deal of well-constructed drill material even for this one aspect of Latin grammar. Pattern practices accordingly play such an important role in language learning that a reviewer could safely proceed on the assumption that no elementary text lacking this kind of drill should be recommended to the profession.

The two basic methodologies, traditional and aural-oral, spring from different evaluations of the role of the intellect or understanding in language learning. Traditionalists lay great stress upon theoretical explanations of grammatical rules, and of course upon the whole technical ter-

minology that goes with them. In class the student must not only comprehend the meaning of a sentence; he must know why and how it means what it does and be able to explain this to the teacher in the accepted jargon. A student presumably will lose points for being unable to identify *gladio* as an ablative of means in the sentence *militem gladio necavit,* even though he might fully grasp the meaning of the sentence. In effect, therefore, the traditional approach to language learning has not been satisfied with the acquisition of the skills needed to control the new language but has felt it necessary to make linguists (albeit amateur ones) out of the pupils, since after all the essential task of the linguist is to explain scientifically the grammatical structure of the language he is studying. At this point we are not condemning the attempt, but it is easy to see how it can be disastrous when distorted or run into the ground by uninspired teachers.

In reaction to this all too often exclusive concern with grammatical theorizing in elementary language classes, the modern approach seems to de-emphasize the intellectual aspects of language learning and concentrate for the most part upon acquiring the needed skills. Obviously, control of a language and ability to analyze it scientifically are two different things. Every native speaker possesses the first; the second is properly the skill of the linguist. The advocate of audio-lingual methods is therefore fully prepared to settle for control as the most desirable and most important goal of language teaching. He hopes that his methods make possible the attainment of that goal. This approach can hardly be attacked — although it has been — on the ground that it is somehow not intellectual enough, not sufficiently humanistic to engage the mature student. Language skills, that is to say, speaking, comprehension, reading, writing, are certainly human activities demanding intellectual effort to no small degree. Aural-oral methods, after all, do not succeed with chimpanzees, nor for that matter with people who for one reason or another do not make the basic commitment to learning. Mastering a grammatical pattern in such a way as to be able to produce well-formed phrases or sentences requires at some point that flash of insight into the nature of reality, in this case linguistic reality, that characterizes all human intellectual efforts. It is not essentially different from the physicist's realization that his hypothesis will really explain the phenomena. So while the new methodology does deëmphasize one highly intellectual and praiseworthy line of scholarly endeavor, the scientific linguistic study of the language in question, in order to obtain more time for the drills needed to give the student mastery of the new patterns, it is unfair to stigmatize this as anti-intellectual.

Occasionally one hears eloquent pleas for the necessity of immersing Latin students almost immediately in real literature. In this respect,

presumably we teachers of the Classics have an advantage over our counterparts in the modern languages who are constrained by all sorts of pressures to aim at aural-oral proficiency. Attempts, however, to implement these exhortations are usually unrealistic and end with the student plowing his weary way through material much too difficult for his level of competence — and very likely resolving to drop Latin at the first opportunity. There is no sense in attempting Caesar or Cicero before one has acquired a certain degree of fluency in reading Latin suited for neophytes; as in life, so in language skills we must crawl before we can walk.

So far we have seen the very real differences between the traditional and modern methodologies and the theoretical assumptions underlying both. My own allegiance is, I suppose, evident from the somewhat prejudiced report I have given. However, since intradisciplinary squabbles of this kind are undesirable at any time and especially now when so many people, even educated people, consider classical studies irrelevant to the modern world, we might inquire into the possibility of reaching an ecumenical meeting of minds between representatives of the two approaches to learning Greek or Latin. This *rapprochement* ought to begin with a clarification of the term 'grammar,' for it is over this word that fundamental and futile disagreement takes place. One side stands accused of neglecting grammar, the other of overstressing it; but from the viewpoint of the linguist neither accusation makes sense. 'Grammar' is used in two fundamental senses in modern linguistics. It refers first of all to the inner or mental knowledge that the native speaker possesses of his language. Grammars therefore exist primarily as abstract structures in the mind and brain of human beings, who consequently have the ability to generate and comprehend well-formed sentences. Without this assumption of an internal system, there is no sufficient explanation for the regularities that we observe in actual sentences. No speaker of Latin, for instance, ever produced a sentence like '*hominem ab amici interficitur*,' for the simple reason that it is ungrammatical, that is, not generable by the actual rules of the language. He is forced by the rules to say '*homo ab amico interficitur*.' The native speaker is in effect a walking grammar; as a child he had to learn a dynamic set of rules which now enable him to compose an infinite number of correct (grammatical) sentences. These rules are controlled so well that the actual speaking becomes semi-automatic. Latin speakers obviously did not reflect on how to put *amare* into the future passive, third person singular; the word *amabitur* was on their lips when they needed it in a sentence.

The second sense of 'grammar' is quite traditional. Linguistic studies of specific languages are called grammars. In this usage a gram-

mar is a theory or theoretical report of the language in question. It corresponds in some way with the internal grammar which is the possession of the native speaker. For instance we require of the linguist's rules that they have the same generative power as the rules in the mind of the native speaker; that is, they must be able to account for the infinite set of sentences which can occur in the language. Needless to say, the linguist does not directly observe the neurological activity of the speaker, any more than the physicist can see the protons, electrons, etc., which play such an important role in his theories. In a grammar the elements, classes, and combinatory rules function as a total theory explaining the linguistic behavior of groups of human beings.

Thus statements which occasionally emanate from the aural-oral camp, decrying the importance of grammar at the elementary level, are misleading; it is precisely this grammatical training which gives us control over the language. Under the direction of his teacher the first-year student works at building up the semi-automatic habits of a proficient user of the language; in other words he is engaged with the internalization of the totality of Latin grammar — a speeded-up repetition of the task he successfully accomplished with his native language during childhood. Furthermore no one should object to a systematic presentation from time to time of the grammatical structures of Latin, for example the various declensions, provided the instructor realizes that he is teaching grammar in the second sense defined above. Unfortunately, however, much that passes for grammatical training is pointless. The distinctions among certain ablatives, for instance, depend solely on the meanings of the particular words selected. If we control the construction and know the meanings of these words, we understand the sentence. In sentences like '*illo tempore venit*' and '*illa hasta necatus est*' it is traditional to speak of an ablative of time and an ablative of means. Grammatically these distinctions are irrelevant, since both sentences would receive the same syntactic description. Time spent in this kind of semantic hair-splitting might more profitably be used in, say, transforming nominatives into ablatives within the context of a drill which teaches the relationships between active and passive constructions.

In the interest of concord, therefore, advocates of aural-oral methodologies might be persuaded to give up their aversion to the term 'grammar.' Pattern practices, as we have seen, teach grammar in the sense of internal control of linguistic structures. An up-to-date and formal presentation of these structures will help the student to understand speculatively the system he is working to dominate. The traditionalist, on the other hand, must begin to appreciate the necessity of well-constructed drill material in sufficient quantity to enable the student to master as efficiently as possible the grammatical patterns of Greek or Latin.

2. THE NATURE OF LITERARY DOCUMENTS:
Some reflections on the teaching of Roman literature

Kenneth Quinn

My subject is how we should teach classical literature — or rather Latin literature, with which I have had more to do in recent years than Greek. But before I talk about *how*, I want to say something about *why*. I feel we are confronted in classical studies today by no task more urgent than that of scrutinizing our basic assumptions. For in the present crisis I fear equally two opposite tendencies. One is the impulse to bring our subject up to date at any cost — even that of turning it into something else. This surely is the counsel of despair. Nevertheless many people, including some who regard themselves as well disposed towards the Classics, no longer consider it self-evident that the study of literature is the core of a classical education. The opposite impulse is to preserve the *status quo;* to close the ranks; to ensure that an ancient discipline does not lose its identity. The trouble here is that we may find ourselves preserving not what is truly valuable in the classical tradition but a particular stereotype of a classical education, based on assumptions and a methodology that are those of the 19th century rather than those of antiquity, or even the Renaissance; the way we go about our business may just cease to make sense to our colleagues in related disciplines.

These are not issues to be swept aside. The first part of my argument (in which I shall put forward five theses — each deserving fuller discussion than I have space for) is intended, therefore, as a quick clearing of the air.

My *first thesis* is that it is the literature of Greece and Rome which forms the really important side of a classical education, the thing that makes even a limited study of the Classics worth while in a busy modern world, the thing that ultimately justifies the position we who teach the Classics feel the Classics *should* occupy in an educational programme where a massing host of plainly worth-while subjects battle for room to breathe.

As a literature man myself, I am prone to assume that my first thesis hardly needs serious proof. I keep discovering, however, that this is an opinion which many of my colleagues do not share and which some would regard as eccentric.

Let me indicate briefly how I should go about proof, if proof of this thesis were my main concern.

I should begin with an analogy that terminates in a question. Much has been written about what has taken place in the Congo since it ceased to be a Belgian colony and became an independent State. Sup-

pose we confine ourselves to what we might expect to find on this topic in any decent university library; if we were whimsically inclined or wished to confuse the issue, we could call this the literature of the subject. It would comprise, I suppose, newspaper files, articles in serious periodicals by the score, and already a fairish number of books. We could not deny that the events dealt with are interesting, complex, instructive and important. We should expect to find that an evaluation of the documents called for industry, patience, intelligence, detachment from prejudice, judgment — some grasp, in short, of the basic techniques of research. We should be dealing with a culture and patterns of development that called for considerable adjustment to our thinking if we were to understand them. It seems reasonable to call this an educational activity, both because we should have to learn to manipulate a complex body of material and because we should expect our activity to inspire reflections of fairly far-reaching relevance. Since many of the important documents must be in French, we might reasonably claim also for our activity those incidental benefits that are said, at any rate by some educationists, to derive from the study of a foreign language.

We have, in other words, assembled a set of claims that sound pretty much like the claims that many would make in defence of a classical education in the modern world. The main difference, if we made the Congo our study instead of, say, Thucydides or Tacitus, is that we should be dealing with things widely known about and commonly regarded as important. How, then, can we say a student is better occupied poring over Thucydides (in Greek) or Tacitus (in Latin) when he could learn the same skills and develop equal powers of judgment from the study of something less hermetically shut off from the generality of informed, intelligent human beings?

There are a number of honest answers, I think, and all of them seem to me to depend on a proper understanding of the nature of literary documents. One answer is to stress the evident literary quality of Thucydides and Tacitus. Another is that we do not read Thucydides and Tacitus in a vacuum; they have a literary context: what makes the Greeks and the Romans interesting and instructive is not the relevance of their wars, blunders, and genuine political achievements to ours, so much as their awareness of their human predicament; their ability to understand what was happening and to recreate in their imaginative literature (with that obliquity which gives personal knowledge enduring form and wide relevance) their experience of what it feels like to be thinking human beings in a mysterious, beautiful, cruel, exciting, baffling, comic, tragic world.

When we talk of our debt to the ancient world, it is a literary debt we mean, or should mean. As men and women the Greeks and

Romans were clearly different from us in a number of ways, and some of the differences go very deep. But from the writings of the Greeks and the Romans we have learnt an attitude to the world. However primitive and violent the emotions Greek tragedy confronts us with, the attitude of mind we encounter is one we recognize as our own.

The process has gone on for so long that many of us are oblivious of the source of the beliefs and prejudices which make us what we are. Perhaps I may describe this attitude summarily as rationalism plus moral concern: an ability to analyse and connect (which is the result of a deeply felt urge to see straight) and a respect for cleverness, plus a sense of responsibility prompted by the wish to act fairly. The impulse to be intellectually right and the wish to be morally right are of course interdependent.

Our Judaeo-Christian, Western European culture differs in many of its ideals from the cultures of Greece and Rome. But our intellectual formation remains (or rather, has become) Graeco-Roman. The Chinese and the Indians can teach us a lot. But they will not help us as directly as the Greeks and Romans in understanding ourselves. We may of course be grievously mistaken, but we are convinced that reason and natural justice are the right tools to deal with the world; we are ashamed of violence unless we can defend it rationally; mysticism and resignation leave us puzzled.

I call this a literary study, though it takes in philosophy, just as a moment ago I assumed that literature would take in historical writing. My reason is not the now somewhat old-fashioned reason that a writer on history or philosophy may achieve literary excellence. It derives rather from a broader view of literature than used to be customary. I regard historical, philosophical and literary texts (in the narrower sense) all as documents in the history of ideas. I place literary studies firmly among the social sciences, instead of regarding them as a kind of applied philology.

The extraordinary timelessness of most of what is best and a good deal that is second-rate in Greek and Latin is due to its peculiar relevance to us as the spiritual descendants of the Greeks and Romans. I have in mind here qualities such as argumentative reasonableness, good humour, detachment, the sense of verbal fun, a pleasure in the adroit manipulation of words. My argument is in some ways an extension of T. S. Eliot's argument that we cannot understand our own literary tradition without knowing something, rather a lot in fact, about Greek and Latin literature, because our own literature is shot through and through with echoes of the Greeks and Romans. Eliot is apt to make it all sound like an accident which we might wish not to have occurred. I suppose it is an accident; we cannot help being what we are. But it

seems to me a very fortunate accident, and I think we should be unwise to discard the benefits history has thrust upon us.

It must be clear that I do not submit this as a watertight case, but merely as some notes for making what I am persuaded is an honest case and a good one. If it has a weakness, it is that its validity depends on taking Greek and Latin literature as a unity. How sound the case remains if we base it on Latin alone is something I must leave undiscussed. The things I really want to talk about are still a long way ahead of me.

Let us assume that my first thesis, though I have not proved it, is provable. It may seem a conventional thesis, even a reactionary one, more old-fashioned than novel; so old-fashioned indeed that it can no longer be adopted by those who regard themselves as progressive. But if my position is reactionary, it is so in that I react against external stresses, the *Aquilo impotens* of ill-guided educational reform. Many who teach the Classics feel that reform is urgent. I am in entire agreement about the need for action. I do not agree, however, that the thing to do is to turn the subject into something else. I am not questioning the right of the specialist to devote himself to the things that interest him, nor am I questioning the importance of some of these specialist studies. But the traditional emphasis seems to be the right one. What is wrong is the way the subject has been taught.

Anyone who studies the history of the teaching of Classics in 19th-century England, who has read for example Professor M. L. Clarke's admirably succinct outline, can hardly avoid a somewhat chastening conclusion. It is that while throughout the 19th century the study of the Classics expanded in England at an unprecedented rate, it did so for all the wrong reasons. The Classics became the basis, almost the whole structure of the educational system, more by accident than by design. Greek and Latin were the subjects that had always been taught in schools, and they therefore continued to be taught when the public-school system expanded. It was the same in the universities.

This might have mattered less if those who taught the Classics had possessed a deeply felt, clearly thought-out conviction, such as that possessed by Renaissance scholars, of the uncontestable supremacy of Greek and Latin literature. In fact this was not so. In so far as they had ideas about education, these tended to be *moral* ideas. What seemed to matter was that the study of the Classics was an exacting, systematic discipline. Any who thought about the intrinsic merits of the authors studied with such diligence and attention to detail soon found their minds filled with misgivings. Roman literature in particular seemed such dull stuff. The few who genuinely loved what they taught must have suffered at the evidence each day brought of the impossibility of communicating

their affection in the atmosphere and within the prescribed routine of the classroom. The majority sought refuge in a philistinism that was most often barely conscious, but sometimes openly cynical. Those who did not, stood out as giants — men soaked in the Classics, who loved their Horace and their Virgil, who by the force of their personality inspired a confused understanding that there was something to be loved. But when we come to look more closely at these giants, they strike us as oddly ineffectual. The more acute the sensibility of those they taught, the more disastrously these men failed to communicate their love. Lesser pupils were perhaps content to accept an affection they could not understand. Byron learned at Harrow to hate Horace, though he realised the fault did not lie in Horace. Mr. Robert Graves took away from the Charterhouse and the great T. E. Page ('teasing gentle old Tommy Page') that contempt of Virgil which recently flashed out afresh at Oxford after smouldering for fifty years.

We owe to this extraordinary phenomenon — one of the curious triumphs of English anti-intellectualism and, I suppose, of educational planning by administrators — the enormous prestige enjoyed by a classical education until recent times (all the best people had had one) and the inculcation of certain ideals that cannot be condemned: thanks to the public schools, Rome, the austere, undaunted, pragmatic Rome of Anchises' prophecy, was all but rebuilt in England's green and pleasant land — to say nothing of what they built in India, in Africa, and in Australia.

Some of us can remember this system when it still flourished. Most of us have grown up at some stage in the long process of its lapse into decay and derision. The trouble started when the poverty of the system's intellectual basis was exposed. Dr. Bolgar has retraced Henry Sidgwick's mercilessly honest analysis and his rejection of what seemed to Sidgwick the fraudulent claims for a classical education. The system easily survived Sidgwick's onslaught, which appeared in 1867. Not being based on reason, it was little affected by rational attack. But long before the edifice crumbled, the rot had begun within. A scholarly minority among teachers of the Classics, who prided themselves on their intellectual honesty, tumbled over one another to agree with Sidgwick before retreating to a last ditch, far behind a front line that they might with integrity have defended.

The position to which these men retreated was the one attacked by Eliot at the beginning of his address to the Classical Association in 1942 — that the study of the Classics was a scholarly discipline of equal dignity with, say, Egyptology and similar specialized studies, and that the opportunity to pursue these studies should, in any liberal society, be provided for the few who are particularly drawn to them. Eliot

charitably ascribed this opinion to an unnamed eminent author (whom he had read while waiting for his dentist), discussing the course education might take when the war was over. In fact, of course, it was an opinion that had been gaining ground for half a century. The known adherence of Housman had won it the unquestioning allegiance of many who admired the brilliance of Housman's intellect, particularly if they were attracted also by the Olympian austerity of Housman's personality. Not only has the phrase 'there must always of course be a small place for the Classics' become an article of faith among many scholars domiciled in Cambridge or trained in Cambridge; it serves almost invariably as the μέν clause of an exordium in which the δέ clause amounts to an admission that a classical education is a waste of time for anybody unlike themselves.

I am coming at last to my real subject. It seems to me that, as the result of the authority attributed — for the best of reasons: the desire to be intellectually honest — by professional classics since Housman's day to a position which was not really a valid one at the time and can now be readily seen to be invalid, the whole question of the nature of literary documents and how we should study them needs, in the context of classical literature, a pretty thorough and searching reappraisal.

A literary text — any literary text — is a historical document. Its genesis is a historical event. It has a historical context and historical consequences, even if these are only its effect on the subsequent course of literature.

I shall now put forward two further theses. My *second thesis* is that literary documents, like other historical documents, require for their understanding a multiplicity of skills, and not always the same skills or in the same proportions. My *third thesis* is that literary documents — again like other historical documents — vary in the extent to which the deployment of these skills is justified.

I expect that to many the propositions I have just put forward will, this time, appear self-evident. If it seems extraordinary how little attention has been paid to such considerations by those who study the Classics, we should remember that my second and third theses depend on a kind of systematic putting in order of historical method which is comparatively recent. To some extent, in short, what is wrong with the study of the Classics is that it needs bringing up to date. The trouble however goes deeper than that.

Briefly, one result of the strenuous searching of conscience by Housman and those who have come under his influence has been to narrow the limits of scholarly method in Classics to a point approaching absurdity: the skills they would allow as legitimate in the interpretation of classical literature form a list that would strike a historian or a

student of modern literature as very peculiar. As for my third thesis, many of them would reject outright the idea that some literary texts are more worth studying than others, as based on an unscholarly criterion and one which it would be irresponsible, if not immoral, to allow to interfere with scholarly activity.

In most cases of apparent obtuseness involving highly intelligent men, one expects to find a historical explanation. In this case, I believe, it is that, however realistic they tried to be, those who felt Sidgwick's arguments unanswerable did not extricate themselves entirely from an illogical emotional commitment to a situation which their logic told them had had its day. Rather than face the need for reform, they were prepared to keep — for the few — the kind of activity they understood best. In looking for a last ditch they placed it on ground selected because it was familiar and congenial.

There was a time when the only justification necessary for the study of a Latin author was that he was a Latin author. From the Renaissance to the end of the 18th century the question of justification hardly arose. The 19th century lost most of its faith in the Latin classics. (To some extent it rediscovered a faith in the Greek classics, but that is something I must leave on one side here.) It did so, however, at precisely the time when the Latin classics were becoming more and more the universal basis of the educational system. But once you pin your faith on the value of Latin instead of on the value of the Latin authors as authors, an interesting readjustment results. Schoolboys no longer study Caesar or Ovid because the value of studying Caesar or Ovid is unquestioned, but because they learn Latin by studying Caesar and Ovid. The value of Caesar and Ovid may be openly questioned even by those who practise the system, so long as the value of learning Latin remains unquestioned.

This is liable to leave out in the cold the writers whose Latin is too hard or too bad (to serve as a model for prose composition — the objective of which is to learn Latin) or too obscene, or is in other ways unsuitable for those who want to learn Latin. But once the idea gets around that some, many, or all of the authors regularly studied are of dubious value, or patently negligible, then it is easy to argue that one author is as good as another, that hard authors are intellectually more profitable than easy ones, or that scholars should not get mixed up in questions of taste or fashion but concentrate on preserving and purifying the classical heritage.

For there are of course senses in which Caesar and Ovid, or Valerius Flaccus or Fronto or Manilius, any literary document in fact, is permanently worthy of study. One is the sense in which a flint arrow is worth studying. A flint arrow is also a document. Though not an

eloquent one, it can teach us something about a past culture. It can provide, not only for the specialist but also for the schoolboy, an insight into a world that no longer exists. It can contribute a little to that understanding of the past without which we shall never fully understand the present. The flint arrow suggests also another sense in which any literary document is permanently worthy of study. As the arrow arouses the excitement of the archaeologist, so the driest ancient text can arouse the excitement of the philologist. It may be a highly refined excitement, calling into play sophisticated skills, not just the romantic excitement of the antiquarian.

But such texts have little in common with texts to which we should want to ascribe any real literary merit. One difference is that someone else can describe the flint arrow or the mediocre text for us and we can read his report. We may miss his excitement, but our knowledge will not be greatly defective because it is second-hand. A literary text of any merit cannot be reported on. There is no substitute for the work of art itself; its complexity cannot be summarized or its nature felt second-hand.

There are difficulties, however, about admitting this. The admission involves value judgments, for example. Many might suppose this a good thing, but those who devote time and energy to bad, dull authors become touchy about value judgments. Another difficulty is that, once you start throwing out classical authors because they are bad or dull or both, there is no telling where you might want to stop. The feeling is liable to get around that, if we look into our texts at all closely, we may find somehing nasty in the woodshed. Better to admit freely that a lot of classical literature (or at any rate Roman literature — let's do nothing to harm the current popularity of authors like Homer, Sophocles, however suspicious we may be of it) . . . better admit that Roman literature isn't up to much really, but that there should always be a place for the scholarly study of it as a difficult, exacting discipline that keeps something alive, even if it is only ourselves.

Let us climb out of the heady atmosphere of polemic into the rarer air of logical argument.

The conclusion I wish to draw from my second thesis is that the skills which we have got into the habit of considering the appropriate skills to deploy in the study of Roman literary documents have become over-narrowly circumscribed. Even those of us who do not extol textual criticism and grammatical exegesis as the acme of scholarship neglect, to an extent that makes us out of date and exposes us to properly aimed charges of ingenuousness or worse, the study of the cultural context — the political, sociological, intellectual and literary circumstances in which the text came into existence and which determine, and may even

constitute, its significance. I should repeat that I am not concerned here with the use individual scholars make of their time and ability, but with the attitude and practice of the profession as a whole in respect of the teaching of literature. The conclusion I wish to draw from my third thesis is that this kind of study of literary documents must depend on an adequate critical procedure. Here, too, our circumstances today are not those in which Sidgwick or Housman found themselves. Even fifty years ago techniques for the objective, systematic study of the nature and quality of a literary document as literature were rudimentary. We can scarcely blame classical scholars of that time if they fought shy of the idea of talking about classical literature as literature. The business of criticism as an educational discipline was in its infancy. The only critic worth listening to, Housman held in 1911, was the man specially gifted by Heaven. And he, as Housman remarked, was as rare as Halley's comet. That was not a universal view in 1911, and some might suspect Housman of special pleading. But what justified it was the absence of a decent standard of critical competence. In the last fifty years things have changed. We know more now about how to study literature and how to teach it.

I have argued that classical literature is important and that the study of it should be complicated. My *fourth thesis* is that the study of classical literature is something that can be taught. I shall even be rash enough to sketch a procedure.

But before I do so I must get out of the way my *fifth* and final *thesis*. It is that the study of classical literature as literature can begin early — as soon as the boy or girl acquires anything that in the most generous spirit can be called facility. What I am attacking here is the doctrine of First Things First, which has tended to become an article of faith among those whom I may perhaps be allowed for convenience to call the *epigonoi* of Housman. A logical system of priorities (first settle the text, then the bits where the meaning is hard, then think about it, then talk about it — if you are Halley's comet) is often uncritically accepted as though it were a system of psychological or educational priorities. If you are building a house it is doubtless prudent to build the foundations first. If you are conducting an argument you must insist on a priority of assumptions — the method I am attempting to follow here. But it is part of the nature of historical documents that they are not amenable to such a system of logical priorities. The experience of literature, like any other complex human activity, cannot be logically compartmentalised. The skills required are interdependent, they cannot be learnt one by one. We develop each by practising all in concert. How then do we go about this?

I shall describe a critical procedure that I have developed myself, because it is the one I understand best.

This method may be defined as the responsive interrogation of the text, guided by a study of the political, sociological, literary and intellectual circumstances. You might put it more simply and say that it consists in finding the right questions to put to a text, and then finding the right answers. I say 'finding' in both cases because the decision what are the right questions is not always easily made; both finding the questions and answering them involves the deployment of knowledge, taste and imagination. I must insist that the third of these qualities — imagination — which is apt to be regarded as a frill, is as essential as the other two: every historical document, but especially so complex a document as a poem, depends for its understanding upon the recognition of things which to the unimaginative intelligence will seem not to be there at all. The unimaginative interpretation of a letter, a treaty or a poem isn't just a more limited interpretation; it is usually a historically wrong interpretation.

How do we decide which are the right questions? We must avoid not only silly questions, but unprofitable questions. For there are three types of criticism: the kind that is wrong, or wrong-headed; the kind that gets its facts right but takes us nowhere — a very common kind; and the kind that finds questions and answers that broaden and illuminate our understanding. The critic's function is not so much that of a guide to a museum as that of the conductor of an orchestra or the producer of a play who saturates himself in his score or his text in order to realize, from the clues the score or text provides and from his knowledge of many related things, the unstated intentions of the composer or the dramatist. We have all had experience of the way in which a text or score comes to life in the hands of a first-class producer or conductor. It would be a bold man surely who would declare that, because the text or score seems dead on the printed page, it did not live in the mind of the dramatist or the composer.

It might seem that the basic question to ask is: What is this play or poem or letter about? In fact this is often a very hard question, the final synthesis of many questions and answers (what *is* the *Aeneid* about?). We can break it down, however, into three basic questions. The first is: *What does the writer say?* The second is: *Why does he say it?* The third is: *How does he say it?*

Does this sound like a system of logical priorities? That is not what I intend. We can hardly, of course, ask ourselves three questions simultaneously. We must keep moving backwards and forwards from one to the other. The study of a literary document is better regarded as an exploration of a complicated, exciting new territory than as a prob-

lem to be solved by logic and ingenuity. What seems the right question to ask first may prove at the outset insoluble. The thing to do is to strike out in a fresh direction.

Let us consider what these three basic questions imply, remembering that the order in which we take them now is not necessarily the right order in which to put them to a particular text. Generally speaking, of course, our first question, '*What does the writer say?*', must come first. Determining the way the Latin words fit together into a series of statements will be almost always a necessary preliminary to the exploration of a text. On the other hand, if the text before us — an ode of Horace perhaps — is one whose meaning depends heavily on structure — formal organization of the sense in metrical patterns, repetition of key phrases, and so on — we may want to start asking Question 3 before we can dispose of Question 1.

I regard this, however, as an extreme case. For I have been careful to make my first question '*What does the writer say?*', not 'What does the writer mean?' The meaning, in any full sense, of a complex literary document can emerge only as a result of persistent, responsive interrogation of it. Even an accurate grasp of what the writer *says* is not easily won. I find I have to train my students away from the idea, which has not, I imagine, been consciously inculcated but which they have been allowed to form for themselves, that the statement which a piece of Latin makes is not something that can be accurately fixed at all. They are apt to regard a Latin syntactical unit as a crude form of statement which they must twist around till it sounds respectable in English. I am not speaking of the kind of adaptation necessitated by differences of idiom, but of a method of translation in which the form is obliterated by free paraphrase. The aim is to bring out the sense. But young students quickly come to feel that the Latin original, as a result of some special linguistic poverty, *needs* this improvement. They are naturally perplexed by what seems to them the alarming vagueness of Latin words. The dictionaries they consult break down the whole area of usage of a complex word, the whole range of its connotations, into a string of meanings, all apparently equally explicit. But more to blame, I feel, are old-fashioned methods of teaching prose composition, in which elaborate, woolly English statements are boiled down into simple, direct Latin statements; so that when students come to translate Latin they feel obliged to turn simple, direct Latin statements into elaborate, woolly English statements. In translating poetry this results in a habit of prosing away the poetry till the meaning may actually be destroyed and appreciation rendered impossible.

I try to teach my students that translation is a process of groping one's way towards the sense of the Latin words, of considering and

rejecting translations that are as literal as possible, until one has found a formulation that can be accepted — not the one that sounds the most impressive in English, but the one that is the best substitute for the Latin. I try to get the student away from the vocabulary equivalents he learnt in his first years of Latin. For the vacabulary equivalent may be weaker or stronger than the Latin word. Usually the Latin word is stronger: *miscere, adfligere, cura* are examples; to translate *miscere* as 'mix' is often to ruin the meaning of the Latin. But some Latin words are weaker: *cadere* is often better represented by 'drop' than by its stock vocabulary equivalent 'fall'; 'forest' will often do for *silva,* but will be inappropriate when all the Latin writer means is a clump of trees. Or the Latin word may be a bigger word or a smaller word. Or the English equivalent may be a word that has survived in Latin vocabularies since the eighteenth century but has dropped out of our current speech so that it sounds ridiculous or archaic when the Latin word doesn't. Or there may just be no reliable equivalent. I find useful the concept that words have areas of meaning which can be represented by circles. The circle of the Latin word and that of its vocabulary equivalent may be nearly concentric and equal in radius; or the two circles may overlap imperfectly, or hardly overlap at all; or they may be quite different in area.

In some circles translation is apt to be derided as old-fashioned: one should train the student, it is said, to think in the language, and translation interferes with this. So long as the process of reading a line of Virgil is automatically accompanied by an English statement assembled out of the vocabulary equivalents of the Latin words, this is undeniable. On the other hand I find translation the best procedure I know of for a preliminary systematic exploration of the sense. It is important to learn to think in Latin and not actually, I believe, difficult. But until we really know Latin very well, thinking in Latin, unless it is backed up by translation, is apt to result in blurred impressions. In my practical criticism seminar in Melbourne, where we spent a two-hour session exploring, say, thirty to fifty lines of verse, I asked my students to make a written translation beforehand; when we met, we often found it advantageous to spend most of the first hour in arriving at an adequate translation — in settling, in short, the answer to our first question. By insisting that accurate determination of the sense is difficult but possible, we can train the student to understand what is liable at first to seem to him paradoxical or perverse — the idea that a poem (for example) exists only as a complex of Latin words. It requires time and persistence to eradicate the belief that one goes about studying a Latin text as one goes about shelling peas — by ripping the text open, tearing out the intellectual nourishment it contains, and then throwing away the verbal husk.

We are on the verge of anticipating our third question. Let us turn instead to our second question: *Why does he say it?* We may call this the process of tuning in to a text. It involves really two rather different kinds of adjustment to our thinking.

One is the adjustment imposed by our historical sense. This sounds perhaps like making allowances, letting our author off lightly because he wrote a long time ago, or doing something ourselves to make his meaning clear because he can't be expected to make it clear for himself. I have in mind something rather more legitimate and a good deal more difficult. The function of our historical sense is to situate the document we are studying in its intellectual context, to give it its right place in the history of ideas. On a more modest level this means getting the right reactions to the key words; on a more ambitious level it means trying to decide why an orator thought an argument would prove effective with the audience he had in front of him; or why an idea, or an image, seemed important or fresh or moving to a poet — or why it seems to have given him so much trouble. These and similar questions (for each of our three basic questions is only a starting-point for many more) are all part of the critical response that an educated man should make to *any* text. Answering them calls for a lot of information. It may call also for considerable sensitivity in applying what we know, or can discover, about the historical circumstances of a text. In dealing with Virgil's *Aeneid*, for example, we have to distinguish between those ideas about the nature of the world which Virgil actually held and those which are part of the fictional hypothesis of his poem — between his beliefs on the one hand and the areas in which he invites conscious suspension of disbelief on the other.

The second kind of adjustment is involved where an author decides to stop short of full explicit statement of his meaning. There is a danger, in reading a foreign language, of feeling we can relax when we have fitted the words together and extracted sense from them. But with a writer like Virgil or Tacitus or Horace we may not stop there. We must keep asking ourselves: *Why does he say this?* The technique of these writers is highly selective. The statements they make, in addition to their face value, are often dramatically significant (they give us an important clue about what is going on) or psychologically significant (they reveal the thoughts of a character). The better a writer, the more he is likely to prefer this kind of obliqueness to open statement. It saves time, it challenges the reader's response and keeps him alert.

I expect these may sound like high-minded and philosophical reflections, and therefore of limited practical relevance to the everyday routine of the classroom. Yet on the most unpretentious level of appre-

ciation, asking the question *'Why does he say that?'* can prove a constant source of illumination. Among the idiosyncrasies of his contemporaries with which Horace equates his passion for writing poetry is that of the hunter (*Odes* 1. 1. 25–6):

manet sub Ioue frigido
uenator tenerae coniugis immemor.

Too often the phrase *tenerae coniugis immemor* is treated as the kind of cliché that can be disregarded the moment it has been translated, perhaps with the comment that *tenerae* is a stock epithet. Yet this is a simple example of failure to respond to a text. If it is true, as is often said, that Latin talks through verbs, it is also true that Latin talks through adjectives more than English: the adjective builds in the sort of incidental comment to which we would allot a phrase. The hunter's wife was likely to have been a lot younger than himself — a common situation at Rome, as in all societies where matches are arranged. That should be part of our response. Another is to catch the sensitive, double-edged irony of Horace's comment: the hunter (like Horace in his passion for poetry) is a bit of a fool, but he is heartless too: guided by our recollection of Catullus' use of *immemor* in Poem 64, our sympathy goes out for an instant to the young girl left alone all night (here we need to respond to a special sense of *manet*) by her self-centred husband.

Too often poetry is read with the kind of limited facility of response with which many people, I suspect, listen to a broadcast commentary of a cricket match. They understand the terms the commentator uses (cover point, leg break, square cut, and so on) in the sense that they know what these words mean. But their reactions are blunted, they do not properly reconstruct the scene which the commentator is describing. To put it in terms appropriate to literary criticism: an intellectual apperception takes the place of a full response to a visual image.

Our third question, *'How does he say it?'*, is intended to focus our attention on the way in which a writer achieves his effects. There is both a negative and a positive side to our response here. The negative side includes training in not looking for the wrong things — and therefore making irrelevant criticisms. For example, before we accuse a writer of obscurity we should consider whether something may not be gained by a lack of clarity. We may blame a poet for not being what we have carelessly assumed him to be, instead of praising him for what he is.

The positive side of our third question deals with what is sometimes called structural analysis and made to seem one of the inner mysteries of the critic's temple. For people who know no formal gram-

mar, who cannot tell an adjective from a relative clause, structural analysis *is* apt to appear obscurantist hocus-pocus. It is one of the advantages possessed by the teacher of Latin literature that those whom he teaches *must* be equipped for the appreciation of the structural qualities of what they read, by grammatical necessity. All that is needed is to relate grammar intelligently to appreciation, to point out, for example, how a sentence of Virgil differs structurally from a sentence of Cicero and why; or to point out what Horace gains by making the verbal fabric of his odes so complex.

You will notice I have said nothing about quality, nothing about the teacher's obligation (to use A. D. Godley's words) 'to invite pupils to admire the beauties of great literature.' This does not seem to me the teacher's function — or, for that matter, good strategy. I would not go beyond enjoining an appropriate attitude of mind in exploring a text (I might describe it as 'alert humility') and deprecating an attitude fatal to appreciation, the common attitude of the man who patronizes his author or sneers at him openly. Unlike some, I believe that judgment is something that should properly emerge from critical exploration. But that is not its objective. One does not have a meal in a famous restaurant in order to form the opinion that it was or was not a first-class meal, though it is *worth* forming an opinion and sensible to devote some reflection to this.

On the other hand, though it is not the object of critical exploration to select and reject, we should not confine our attention to what we believe to be first-rate. It can be highly instructive to put a third-rate text before students. They will be taught to discriminate. What is perhaps more important is that the occasional third-rate text lends an air of reality to the study of Latin literature; if everything he reads is presented as subtle, profound and deeply moving, the intelligent student will begin to suspect (perhaps quite wrongly) that the game is crooked, that the response expected of him is an exaggerated one.

I must stop and attempt to sum up. What do I claim for the critical procedure I have outlined? First, that those who adopt it can hardly fail to read Latin with enjoyment. This must surely seem an important and a needed reform. What seems to me more important is that those we teach will learn to appreciate what they read. There is a tendency to assume that 'appreciation' is a cant word used by those who talk about literature, when all that is meant is enjoyment. I mean a good deal more. I mean a discerning comprehension which is often enjoyable, but is also instructive: our understanding of the world is broadened and deepened. The procedure I am recommending can be applied as readily to historical and philosophical texts as to imaginative literature. It will teach the student the necessity — and the complexity — of

understanding his author, instead of concentrating on whether what is said is true or false in the light of present-day knowledge, or reading his author in a hostile frame of mind that amounts to a failure to respond: on the lookout only to score debating points off him.

I doubt, in short, if any more broadly educational and humanizing activity exists than the study of literature along these lines. I must insist that what I have in mind is more than an intensive method of studying highly-charged literary texts. At its widest, it amounts to using texts for the exploration of a whole civilisation. Professor Martin Wight in the first number of *Didaskalos* has described experiments at the University of Sussex in using literary documents as historical documents. Perhaps I may claim to have outlined the critical procedure which should, in my opinion, guide such a method. To some it may appear over-ambitious, involving the critic in a series of amateurisms; they will feel that the traditional methods, though they narrow the scholar's vision, keep him on safe ground. But the man who narrows his vision narrows his understanding.

I think in some ways it may actually be more instructive to study the Classics in this way than to study contemporary literature, but that is not my argument here. My purpose has been to describe a method. If it is adopted, I see ground for optimism. We shall at any rate be able to feel that a discipline which for long has aroused only anxiety and even revulsion can now inspire affection and legitimate concern:

> nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
> nunc desiderium curaque non levis.

We may even hope that the Classics, like Horace's ship, will weather the storm.

3. THE TEACHING OF ANCIENT HISTORY

H. W. Pleket

Our presence here is mainly a result of the fact that our present-day world does not know what to do with the term "classical antiquity." Above all it is the adjective that creates problems. By calling something "classical" we mean to say that it has an everlasting value, that the thing concerned is not merely valuable in its own specific historical setting. Today, implicitly or explicitly, many sociologists tend to think in terms of a unique twentieth century. This means that values developed and upheld in other historical perioids can hardly be of any use to the inhabitants of our world. In fact, American and European psychologists (or with whatever -ism they like to be designated) often preach the doctrine of "life adjustment" as the one and only object of modern

education. The German professor Fritz Blättner puts it bluntly as follows: "Was die Naturwissenschaft und die Technik seit dem 17e Jahrhundert hervorgebracht haben, ist nicht griechisch und hat kein Beispiel in der Geschichte."

As you know, several other attempts have been made in the course of our civilization to clarify the meaning of "classical." The early Renaissance humanists were convinced that eternally valid models of behaviour, attitudes, approaches to life in its totality were provided by the classical world. They identified themselves with that world to such an extent that they called their children Achilles or Agamemnon — ominous names indeed for young boys! — while others claimed to be descendants of Plato. One of the Renaissance "Platos" went so far as to erect a relief of Plato himself, with an inscription reading: "Platonem suum, a quo originem et ingenium refert."

This outdated conception deserves more than a complacent smile. The political, social and economic structure and development of 15th century cities was so similar to that of the ancient *polis*, the use of the term *imperium Romanum* (e.g., in the combination "Holy Roman Empire") so persistent, that the wish to copy the ancient world as faithfully as possible could easily be fulfilled. Moreover the humanist welcomed in the classical *paideia* a much needed antidote against the predominant principles of nobility, birth, pedigree. The rising citizen class provided the pupils for the humanist teachers. Knowledge of (and insight into) the ancient ideal world was meant to enable them to compete with the nobility, whose claims rested on birth and inherited wealth.

In the nineteenth century the liberal citizens of Europe — as Friedrich Schnabel pointed out — were educated and inspired by the so-called Neo-humanists. The "*ancien régime*" gave way to the conceptions of freedom and equality before the law, for the city bourgeoisie. The liberal bourgeoisie — think of 1848! — , guardians of these ideals, were introduced by the "Neuhumanisten" into a world of eternal models of the Good, the Beautiful, the True, etc. They wanted to model their lives on the ideals of a classical world. With the Neo-humanists the aesthetic factor was predominant. Von Humboldt himself, an active politician engaged in many important functions, is said to have given as justification for the pursuit of classical studies: "Ein guter Vers lebt ewig, wenn Kriege und Friedensschlüsse vergehen." In these circles there was little interest in Rome or in the political practices of the ancient world in general. As adherents of constitutional monarchy, they liked to point to the lessons taught by Tacitus on the absolute, tyrannical rule of the

Roman Emperors; while the Greek political philosophers provided suitable arguments to those who feared radical democracy.

The claim made by both the Humanists and the Neo-humanists, to develop the potentialities of independent, critical judgment, of abstract thinking, to train their pupils in *sapientia* and *eloquentia* in a strongly disciplined, almost ascetical "*militia scholastica*" – this claim, as you know or as you can predict, was not fully realised. In the mediaeval and Renaissance world classical education tended to degenerate into a system in which *eloquentia* ousted *sapientia*. To learn Latin – a language used in many professions – became an important objective of education in itself. It is noteworthy that the traditional nobility, in this period of the degeneracy of humanistic education, proceeded to found special academies for its own *jeunesse dorée*, the so-called "Ritterakademien," where the Classics were no longer taught (for the Classics were considered part of the by now "professional" training of the common citizens!), but instead modern languages, music, and mathematics became the core of the program. In the nineteenth century humanistic ideals faced the threat posed by the extension of the number of subjects in school syllabuses. Next to ancient history, the schools during the rising tide of nationalism could not fail to pay attention to the (modern) history of their own countries; geography and science also made their demands.

The idea of "overburdening" begins to emerge, never to disappear again. Classical schooling tends to become at best a formal, grammatical kind of schooling, in which the primary objective of the Humanists is lost sight of.

In the decade 1870–80 we hear of conflicts between headmasters of German grammar schools ("altsprachliche Gymnasien") and owners of bookshops, over the sale of translations of classical authors to schoolboys. Apart from and possibly in reaction to the actual degeneration of classical education, new educational theories arose with new educational slogans: not "*verba*" but "*res*"; not formal training in critical thinking and disciplined judgment, but introduction into contemporary life and society. In England the preachers of utility attacked the position of the humanistic colleges. Locke had questioned the value of learning Latin, and considered utility the main criterion. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the word "utility" gets definite economic overtones. The German professor Friedrich Schnabel considers what he called "Kollektivismus" the dominant factor in our present world. He paints a gloomy picture of this phenomenon, which is the main threat to humanistic education. He fully subscribes to Jakob Burckhardt's famous dictum that crises in history always coincide with the "Eintritt der Masse in die Geschichte." Both scholars emphasize the emotional and irrational as-

pects of "Kollektivismus," and Schnabel goes so far as to speak of "dunkle Begriffe, die von da an durch die Geschichte tönen — Freiheit, Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit, Volkstum, Nation und Rasse, Einheit und Nationwille, Citoyen und Volkgenosse" (p. 85). For Schnabel there is only one antidote: a return to the humanistic "Bildung," with concentration upon Classics and mathematics: such a curriculum will develop the disciplined judgment, the critical thinking of the individual, and only in this way will the latter be able to face the modern world of mass phenomena confidently and critically. Though he is aware that in many fields (science, art, political life, military systems, technology) we are no longer the pupils of our classical masters, Schnabel nevertheless is firmly convinced that antiquity is relevant to us, is *classical*, because it created a unique type of man: "eine einmalige Menschenart." The individualistic culture of the Greeks produced that "Menschenart" which precisely in our times, when "der Eintritt der Masse" reigns supreme, deserves to be cultivated. Schnabel advocates the study of a historical period, a past culture, by twentieth-century youngsters. Modern psychologists and sociologists, on the other hand, very often show strong contempt for history and an even stronger predilection for what the Germans call "Sozialkunde." This branch of knowledge prepares youth for its function in modern society; the latter is hardly an object for critical analysis; its structure is sufficiently, though not completely, known and accepted.

The plain fact is that both history in general and classical studies in particular, as a branch of historical studies, are severely menaced in our world. In Holland the time available for these subjects will probably be very much reduced. The implication of all this is that modern society, modern times, are absolutely unique, incomparable, fully *sui generis* in practically all respects. An anti-historical and, in some modern philosophical circles, un-historical mentality prevails at the moment. On the other hand Schnabel's view and that of his adherents implies that in spite of certain irrefutable differences ("we are no longer the pupils of the ancients"), somehow there exists a fundamental similarity between the ancients and us. Otherwise it would be absurd to transfer the Greek pattern of education of the individual to our age. Though of course any theory of classical education has to be based on the fact that there must be and in fact is some similarity between the ancients and us, Schnabel's view is in my opinion questionable because it is one-sided. First, he presents a very pessimistic picture of our own age. Though in the Athenian democracy, as in ours, the emancipation of the common man presents its awkward aspects, the more pleasant ones both then and now should surely not be forgotten; and in no way can justice be done to any complex historical process or period if one deals

with the French Revolution in terms of "dunkle Begriffe, Freiheit, Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit." Burckhardt's view of Pericles' successors may be understandable in the light of his own peculiar and extremely comfortable environment. Surely a different treatment of the "Athenian Demagogues," to use the title of M. I. Finley's recent paper in *Past and Present*, is not only badly needed but simply imperative from an historical point of view. Moreover, Schnabel and his followers are a welcome illustration of what Finley stated in a recent essay on "Crisis in the Classics" (in *Crisis in the Humanities*, ed. J. H. Plumb): "It was not the Classics which were providing the values so much as it was the values which were choosing the Classics."

I am very much in favour of any education which develops the potentialities and virtues of independent critical judgment, but I most emphatically oppose any attempt to establish a fundamental gap between "individual culture" and "collective barbarism." This is the danger of Schnabel's view, and in fact of anyone who, like a kind of *Plato redivivus*, pours out his acid criticism over a society in which he merely exists, entrenched in his intellectual fortress from which he looks contemptuously at the crowd outside.

Werner Jaeger, the father of the so-called Third Humanism, clearly saw the dangers inherent in this cultivation of the individual as such. Jaeger was not satisfied with von Humboldt's aesthetic appreciation of classical culture; he also objected to the maxims of German *Historismus*, with its fundamental relativism. He advocated an historical approach, with special emphasis on the socio-political aspects of the ancient world. In his *Paideia* he developed his famous (or rather, notorious) theory that the cultural leaders of Greece, from the earliest times to the 4th century B.C., had in fact only one primary objective, viz. the education of human beings both as individuals and as partners in a political community. This eternal *paideia* has been embodied in Greek culture: eternal because it was Jaeger's firm conviction that Europeans could do nothing but return to the ancient sources, that the ancient *paideia* was a value which manifested itself continuously in the post-classical era. This theory has been revived of late by W. Schadewaldt, who in 1956 presented to the learned world the – at least to me – not very clear concept of "Griechentum als Entelechie, als lebendige sich in ständiger Fortgestaltung bewahrende Grundform Europas." Both Jaeger and Schadewaldt suggest that in the begininng of European civilization *to entelés* ("perfection") was there, that positive additions are virtually impossible, that in fact "variations on the theme *paideia*" are all we can do. In spite of his severe criticism of Humboldt's and Winckelmann's classicism, Jaeger (and implicitly Schadewaldt), for all their historical insight and method, nevertheless developed a kind of metaphysical, neo-classisistic

creed in which the dogma of the fundamental identity between ancient and modern man takes a dominant place. It is my thesis that the teaching of ancient history, either as a separate course or integrated into the reading program of Classics in general, has to be related continuously to the problem of whether the species "human being" is liable to a continuous process of change or not, and if so in what way this view can be substantiated. Our initial problem of what the adjective "classic" means is closely tied up with this question. For this word has a definite connotation of "eternal value, not linked up exclusively with one specific historical period."

The above-mentioned anthropological problem is by no means simple, as shown by the diametrically opposing statements of the following scholars: J. Burckhardt: "Unser Ausgangspunkt ist vom einzig bleibenden und für uns möglichen Zentrum, vom duldenden, strebenden und handelden Menschen, wie er ist und immer war und sein wird." David Hume: "Mankind are so much the same in all times and places that history informs us of nothing new or strange. Its chief use is only to discover the constant and universal principles of 'human nature.'" V. H. Galbraith: "It is often stated that you have one constant, since human nature remains the same. This is nonsense: for men are moulded by their ever-changing environment." Even so famous an historian as Lucien Febvre, the spiritual father of the *Annales*, feels uncertain here: over against his view of the ever-changing "psyche" of man throughout the ages, we find the expression "l'homme éternel." The truth is perhaps, as a Belgian professor recently suggested in a paper on "Psychological History," that certain physical/psychical features are common to all human beings (at any rate to *all* human beings in our European civilization), for the simple reason that otherwise any communication between us and our predecessors would be impossible, which is manifestly untrue, but that on the other hand, on this foundation of basic features structures of varying style and shape have been and will be built up. Example: It is a truism to say (but nevertheless some scholars take it as an *a priori* basis for their learned speculations) that in our civilization from the very beginning onwards the love between men and women was the basic element in their mutual relationship (marriage). It is, however, essential for an historian to observe that in ancient literature and public morals the utterances on marriage and the function of woman therein are quite different from ours today. Or rather, that in ancient civilization there is a clear development in philosophical thinking on this topic, a development well illustrated by the title and the narrative of Joseph Vogt's "Von der *Gleichwertigkeit* der Geschlechter in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft der Griechen" and by, e.g., Plutarch's comment on Pericles' famous dictum on the place of women in

5th-century Athens: "On the virtues of women we disagree with Thucydides."

It was the same Plutarch who in his *Erotikos* put forward the theory, or rather confessed, that the matrimonial *eros* was indispensable for anyone who wanted to reach a certain degree of perfection. Matrimonial *eros* was comparable to Platonic *Eros*. This example shows that in classical civilization taken as a whole, man developed several types of behaviour, attitudes, theories, which are relevant to us either by their strict similarity or, on the contrary, by their alienness. Now you may say of course that the very fact that the ancients, in whatever manner, were thinking about the relation man-woman and the meaning of marriage (in other words that they developed a critical attitude towards this phenomenon) is sufficient justification for the role of the Classics in contemporary education. In this sense you may say that their attitude is still the same as ours. But to me this is a very formal view, a bit too meagre to carry complete conviction with our opponents in the social sciences. It would be wiser, in my view, if ancient historians organized their teaching in such a way as to show clearly that the ancients, while using the same faculties as we do, like reason, emotion, analysis, etc., sometimes found solutions for problems which we may accept without any reservations as wise lessons or salutary warnings, whereas in other respects their answers are in good part alien to us.

Historians so far have devoted much time and energy to a study of the development of human behaviour and mentality from the early, "archaic" Middle Ages to modern times. It is my impression that they, understandably enough, tend to forget that these developments can be shown to have occurred in classical civilization as well. It is the teacher's duty to illustrate this fact, i.e., to illustrate Thucydides' famous dictum about *toiauta* and *paraplesia*, and to neglect Aristotle's view of history as a discipline which studies what has happened and nothing more: the purest form of "histoire événémentielle." The apostles of social science, as you know, are convinced that our period is unique and incomparable, that *toiauta* and *paraplesia* never occurred before, that accordingly historical knowledge is worthless. They persistently point to the following factors in modern life: 1) predominance of technology and automation; 2) the rise of "*homo faber*," who needs a thorough professional or vocational training, with a general introduction to present-day society or certain aspects of it; 3) the increasing importance and role of the masses, with correspondingly increasing social mobility.

A general and rather obvious objection to this modern sociological tyranny has been formulated by the Tübingen professor Erich Haag: "Die Technik ist nur die dienende Verwalterin der Mittel; sie bedarf des Herrn, und dieser Herr ist der einzelne Mensch." Consequently a

merely technical education fails to distinguish between means and ends. Haag takes it that a general historical training will enable us to make technology our slave instead of becoming ourselves its slaves. Is it possible to adapt the teaching of ancient history to the demands of our own technological world? In my view it is, provided we choose the right subjects. One of these subjects is precisely the attitude towards technology and science in Greco-Roman antiquity. Here we have a splendid opportunity to elaborate our general, vague statements about similarities and differences. Unfortunately most teachers of ancient history, when they touch upon this subject, tend by their teaching to emphasize the alienness of the ancient world. They will point to the gap between *homo sapiens* and *homo sagax, homo faber,* to use Seneca's language in his 90th Epistle, which is entirely devoted to the problem of technology in ancient philosophy and society. It is an irrefutable fact that many (nearly all) *homines sapientes* in antiquity blocked the development of science and technology; however, it should not be forgotten that at the same time there were authors and politicians with a most favourable attitude towards mechanics, applied technology, etc. The source-book by Cohen and Drabkin furnishes excellent translations of some of the most fundamental passages on this topic: a couple of chapters from Plutarch's *Marcellus;* from Diodorus Siculus on the technological interests of the tyrant of Syracuse, Dionysius; from the late Roman anonymous author *De rebus bellicis,* in which the use of labor-saving war engines is recommended precisely in a period in which shortage of labour seems to be attested; a passage in the life of Vespasian by Suetonius in which the Emperor, though greatly admiring a new mechanism invented by "*mechaniscus quidam,*" refuses to use it, with the words: "You must let me feed my poor commoners."

One-sided emphasis on the views of, e.g., Plato and Seneca may well give a feeling of frustration to our young people, who simply cannot afford to think in terms of a fundamental opposition between *homo sapiens* and *homo faber.* It is dangerous to overestimate the function of science and technology, but more dangerous and in fact downright perverse to underestimate it, or rather to inculcate the Platonic view in our pupils. The modern technological world is a turbulent, restless world; stagnation means decline. Historians seem to think that this modern spirit originates in the Renaissance period — since it was then that a new concept of time arose. Instead of the early medieval notion of time as a cosmic phenomenon, measured in the change from summer to winter, day to night, etc., the inhabitants of the Renaissance towns, inspired by the Humanists, began to live with the clock; working-time became an important concept. Von Martin's book on the sociology of the Renaissance and several studies by the French historian G. Duby

present interesting observations on this problem of the rise of a new mentality, a so-called modern mentality. As far as I know, these historians and many professional ancient historians have failed to note that the modern slogan, "time is money," is more or less an invention of the Greek sophists. "Time is *to polytelestaton analyma*, 'the most expensive investment.' " This point, I hope, sufficiently illustrates what I said about a one-sided tendency of modern historians to date the birth of modern mentality somewhere after the end of the Middle Ages.

Once more I maintain that the ancient historian, both at the university level and in the schools, has to open the eyes of his students to the fact that some so-called modern "developments" in fact are well attested in the course of classical civilization.

What are we to do with that other so-called unique phenomenon: the "massification" of our era? Is our age really unique, in that for the first time the common man is an essential factor in it? I doubt it, and would maintain that provided we take our place on a high level of abstraction, the rise of radical democracy in Athens also represented an "Eintritt der Masse im die Geschichte," or at any rate elicited comments from the so-called educated aristocrats which are very comparable to those given by contemporary people who comment upon the rise of the 20th-century "mob."

Why not read, either in the original or in translation, the sarcastic sneers of the Old Oligarch at the Athenian democracy: it is the uneducated who rule in Athens; vulgarity reigns supreme; the slogan of equality obscures the existing differences between the citizens; slaves dress like citizens and are accordingly not recognizable. Do I really falsify or inadmissibly actualize ancient history if I say that these reactions strongly remind me of contemporary comments by so-called right-wing politicians or philosophers on similar tendencies in our society? I am aware that we no longer have slaves. But for a study of the mentality of that type of politician it does not make any difference whatsoever whether it is the vulgarity, etc., of slaves or of young modern laborers which is called in question. It stands to reason that magnificent passages from Plato can be added to our "Old Oligarch." A paper by Olof Gigon on "Plato und die politische Wirklichkeit" deals with a number of relevant passages, the background of which naturally must be summarily given by the teacher. By "background" I mean the spirit and principles of Platonic philosophy in general. As a useful antidote, the democratic ideology must be presented, preferably by means of the reading of parts or the whole of Pericles' famous funeral speech in Thucydides, Book II. The courageous teacher may then proceed to analyse the structure of Athenian democracy in its main lines, its

differences from and its fundamental similarities to our democracy (cf. M. I. Finley's *Athenian Demagogues*).

Though everybody rightly points to the direct character of Athenian democracy and often assumes a vivid political interest on the part of most Athenian citizens, attention has recently been drawn to the fact that the average Athenian citizen, exactly like the majority of our fellow-citizens, thought in terms of a clique of politicians who did the business, not without considerable profit for their own purse and status; in spite of the structural differences (e.g., absence of political parties, of a politically influential bureaucracy) there remains that fundamental similarity in reaction to, attitude toward, certain political facts and realities. Obviously the position of the Sophists deserves to be dealt with in this connection also. Time forbids me to elaborate this here. The number of ex-grammar school students who easily and without misgivings swallow Plato's view on sophists like Protagoras, etc., is absolutely embarrassing. As an examiner for the Dutch equivalent of the English Certificate of Education, I have seen candidates who translated Vergil or Homer quasi-mechanically, but on a question concerning Pericles, his age and his importance, answered that Pericles lived in the 4th century A.D. and they really did not know much about him.

In order to make our students realize how rare a phenomenon democracy was and is, and how easily it was and perhaps will be replaced by other political systems, we should, if possible, devote some time to a treatment of ancient tyranny and of the Roman Principate.

The recent book by Alfred French clearly shows in how "modern" a way Pisistratus tried to organize Athenian society, partly for his own benefit as political leader, but partly also to solve the socio-economic problems left by Solon. He was the only statesman who introduced direct taxation in Athens; with the money brought in by the taxes he partly subsidized petty Athenian farmers, partly started a program of public works in Athens, partly enriched himself, and we can easily understand that the *demos* liked Pisistratus very much: he was *demotikos* and *praos!* This drives home the lesson that the multitude does not necessarily consist of ardent adherents of democracy; the *primum vivere* and possibly *bene vivere* seems to have been and still seems to be of primary importance. Both the Athenian tyrant and the Roman *princeps* had to cope with a strong and influential nobility. Both availed themselves of the services of some of them, and both had to face serious conflicts with others. The conflict of the *princeps* with the nobility is of paradigmatic value.

The study of Tacitus hardly needs to be recommended, but in my opinion a more selective reading list would render important services. The focus must be on Tacitus' view of the conflict between the Emperor

and the nobility; his famous *deforme obsequium* and *abrupta contumacia*, his words on the relation between *principatus* and *libertas*, his beautiful and still valid comments in the *Dialogus* on the decline of rhetoric and the growth of peace and prosperity, all this is eminently valuable for 20th-century young people, who both in a man like de Gaulle and in many political leaders in under-developed countries meet the modern *princeps*. Tacitus' comment on the correlation between peace, stability, and prosperity on the one hand and the decline of art, political interest, etc., on the other, deserve to be linked with what Pliny the Elder in a famous passage, but in a wider context, says about the same phenomena.

Harold Fuchs' "Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom" gives an excellent introduction to the problem, with all the relevant texts. And who could deny that this is relevant to an age in which political scientists and sociologists organize one symposium after another about the question of how to kindle the ever-declining political interest of man in our modern welfare-state?

The reading of Sentius Saturninus' speech, as recorded in Flavius Josephus and delivered right after Caligula's murder, is revealing in this respect: it illustrates the eternal struggle between an almighty political *princeps* and a traditional nobility, and above all the latter's reaction against him. Saturninus introduces the concept of the *eirene tou tyrannou* as a result of the principate which he despises: peace, abundance, security can never be a substitute for direct, active participation by the individual in political life. But, according to the same senators, it was the mass of the Roman people who preferred rule by the *princeps*; the people regarded him as their "check on the arrogations of power by the Senate." The picture emerges of the political leader who, backed by the multitude, successfully struggles against the nobility. These and similar thoughts become the more relevant to us as we realize that as recently as 1964 the French political philosopher Bertrand de Jouvenel pointed out that in his view nowadays there is a strong tendency towards the principate, the single leader: the principate always has been the most obvious political system and can only be avoided if the "political class" wins and retains the people's confidence.

Though, once again, it is easy to point to fundamental differences between the Roman world and ours (e.g., absence of trade unions, of firmly established, coherent political parties, the importance of *clientela* in Roman politics and its absence nowadays), one is entitled to say that a proper teaching of ancient history may well give a clearer insight into certain processes and structures to be found in our own world.

The foregoing means that in the present state of increasing limitation of time available for the teaching of Classics, we have to admit that the traditional answers which are being given to the question of

why we should teach ancient history are hardly satisfactory, as M. I. Finley has ably pointed out in his forthcoming *Didaskalos* article. These answers were: "It is necessary to provide a historical background for classical literature" (the background argument) and "classical specialists (in the school sense of that word) have to know the outlines of the main periods of Greek and Roman history" (the outline argument). Outline teaching makes most pupils "parrot someone else's value judgments about Athenian demagogues or the Roman mob;" moreover this sort of teaching mostly confines itself to military and constitutional history; and though I myself am quite prepared to get excited about the "peace of Callias," the origins of and motives for the second Macedonian War, "missing senators," and "consulates *in absentia*," I am convinced that there is neither time for nor much sense in discussing such problems with grammar-school boys. It may well make sense to discuss, on a higher level of abstraction, Roman imperialism, what the ancients themselves thought about imperialism — I think of the interesting paper by Walbank in *JRS* 1962 — and the *imperium Romanum* in its structure and functioning.

It is my own experience that a structural analysis of the Roman Empire in which the relation between mother country and province is the dominant theme (a theme, incidentally, that can be dealt with on several levels: economic tax system; political citizenship; provincialization of the senate, army, *equites*) can be very stimulating for history teachers who are fed up with outline teaching but do not know what to do instead.

Let me end with a quotation once again from Finley's paper: "The study of ancient history is in the last analysis not just the study of antiquity, and surely not of antiquities. It should serve to enrich the students' understanding of society, politics and culture in terms of, and in the interests of, their own experience and ultimately of the situations they will face in our society." Finley rejects the use of annotated source books, i.e., of those source books which follow the chronological sequence which are geared to the outline. But what about "thematic source books"? I am not quite sure that Mr. Finley would accept this idea. This method "subverts the essential idea of a book, a plan or a poem," and that is precisely, he says, what the young people must learn to discover themselves; pre-digestion spoils the pupils in this respect. This may be true on a theoretical level, but I do not see why, as Finley puts it, provided there is time, the pupil must read the whole *Protagoras* or the whole of Thucydides instead of concentrating upon Protagoras' myth, Plato's criticism both in this dialogue and elsewhere, some of Thucydides' more contemplative passages and speeches. Would Finley have us believe that the whole of Thucydides' narrative is needed

to "enrich the students' understanding of politics in terms of their own experience"? For school boys, some predigestion is inevitable and may well help the teacher to devote what little time there is to fundamental themes. University students, of course, must not be trained on this principle. They have to discover independently what is important and what not, and why. That is the reason why we as academic teachers, living in a relatively safe and harmonious environment, should be prepared both to select the topics and to collect the material for them. I hope that my talk and this Colloquium will lead to such practical and badly needed results.

IV. THE PRESENT STATE OF CLASSICAL EDUCATION

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

There are departments of classical studies in ten universities in Australia and four in New Zealand. (Sydney has separate departments of Greek and Latin.) Most, but not all, of the universities established in recent years have included Classics in their curricula. Melbourne (13,000 students, Faculty of Arts about 4,000) has a staff of 9 in Classics and about 250 students all told; about 40 spend a major part of a four-years honours course on Greek and/or Latin. The figures for Sydney are a little higher. Both universities have been teaching the Classics for more than a century. The other centres are smaller and more recent. In the main the primary emphasis falls on the study of language and literature, with some provision (not in all centres) for ancient civilisation courses (no knowledge of Greek or Latin necessary). There is a good deal of variation between institutions: in Sydney and Melbourne ancient history is taught by history departments, not departments of Classics; in some of the smaller centres, on the other hand, ancient history or ancient civilisation courses contribute the largest contingent to student numbers in Classics.

In terms of student numbers, personnel, library facilities, etc., the present state of classical studies in Australia and New Zealand is by no means unsatisfactory or discouraging. In all centres active research is going on; in both quality and quantity the work published in the last decade is impressive. There are, however, causes for anxiety. One is the image that Classics presents to the community. In most centres the subject owes the position it still occupies in establishments and curricula more to lip service paid the subject during the 19th century by a colonial society, in which the cultural values implicit in the study of the Classics never took root, than to any continuing respect or rediscovered

enthusiasm. With the transformation of that society, the hold exercised upon the educated community by the Classics has tended – more, I think, in Australia than in New Zealand – to become suspect and precarious. Too often the gathering crisis is met by attempts to develop peripheral disciplines (e.g., art and archaeology) rather than by scrutiny of the basic assumptions and methodology of the central core. Second, there is the situation in the schools: Greek has almost disappeared, Latin is no longer taught with the same rigour. It is of course the same everywhere. This is a situation that seems to me to call for adaptability more than despondency. The modern student, though less well equipped linguistically, is often better equipped in other respects – e.g., for the serious study of literature and history. A factor more disturbing perhaps than either of these is the status of the Humanities in universities that are becoming increasingly centres of scientific research and technological studies. Classics can play a vital role in redressing this imbalance. But if it is to do so, those who teach the subject need more than faith and resiliency. They need a carefully thought out awareness of the value and relevance of their subject; they must be willing to adapt themselves to fundamentally changed circumstances; they must be prepared to teach as well as to undertake research that appears justified because it is arduous; above all, they must be willing to present and discuss their subject in terms that make sense to their colleagues in such related disciplines as history, literary criticism, linguistics, etc. This is a tall order, but there are signs in some centres that the nature of the challenge is understood: one can only hope it will be met.

Kenneth Quinn

BRAZIL

La situation des études classiques au Brésil est bien particulière et assez critique. Pour la comprendre il faut tenir compte de deux faits:

a) Il s'agit d'un pays en voie de développement; il est donc naturel qu'on y trouve la formation d'une mentalité pragmatiste qui enviasge avec méfiance tout ce qui ne contribue pas d'une manière immédiate, visible et grossièrement efficace à résoudre les problèmes économiques et sociaux du pays.

b) D'autre part, la tradition des études classiques que nous a léguée le Portugal – rhétorique et de pure érudition – fausse complètement le sens de ces études. La civilisation classique est censée être la voie unique du salut et de la formation spirituelle; en outre, l'accent obsessionnel mis sur un traitement exclusivement linguistique ou grammatical la vide de son contenu le plus profond. Tout ceci est aggravé par le manque de personnel spécialisé et d'instruments de travail (les bibliothèques, par example, sont extrêmement pauvres en ce domaine)

et aussi par la prolifération désordonnée des Facultés des Lettres improvisées.

Le choc entre le pragmatisme et cette activité intellectuelle bien douteuse, réduite à une mémoire inutile et engourdissante, a enraciné le préjugé dont parlait M. Dihle l'année dernière, qui consiste à voir dans les études classiques un instrument capable de "corrupt the sense of social responsibility." Dans un moment si décisif pour notre histoire, les études classiques sont envisagées comme des distractions pour l'esprit (du raffinement, des ornements, ou un "hobby"), non pas vraiment comme une affaire d'intelligence et encore moins comme une *prise sur la réalité*. Ceci explique la lutte contre l'enseignement du grec et du latin. Celui-ci a été virtuellement banni de l'enseignement secondaire, car on l'a transformé en "matière à option," c'est-à-dire, que personne ne choisit. Le grec l'était déjà depuis un certain temps. Le vitalité de ces études à l'Université ne saurait donc être remarquable. Le nombre d'étudiants est très restreint et, à part quelques exceptions, les raisons qui les poussent vers des études universitaires des civilisations classiques sont assez peu consistante ou légitimes.

La solution du problème ne peut pas se plaçer au niveau des réformes de structure et du statut actuel, que prétendent les paladins de nos études classiques. Ce serait continuer dans la fausse voie et confirmer tous les préjugés et toutes les méfiances en cours. Il faut tout d'abord arriver à un changement radical dans la façon d'envisager le monde classique et nos moyens d'approche. Pour ce faire il faudrait développer de petits groupes en gestation et leur créer des conditions de travail: il y a dans la nouvelle génération des éléments qui ont compris l'inanité nuisible de cette facheuse tradition rhétorique. D'autre part, plusieurs demandes de collaboration sont addressées aux Départements d'études classiques par des spécialistes non-classiques mais qui sentaient le besoin d'une formation ou d'un appui classique. Serait-ce le signe de ce développement souhaitable prévu par M. Earl lorsqu'il nous parlait en 1964 de la "classical education as service department"?

En tout cas, il ne faut pas penser en gros; il faut envisager des noyaux limités mais solides. Plutôt que la guerre nucléaire, le guerrille: c'est plus en accord avec les conditions de l'Amérique Latine . . .

U. Bezerra de Meneses

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

L'an dernier j'avais renseigné brièvement les membres de ce Colloque sur l'état actuel des études classiques en Tchécoslovaquie.[1] Depuis

[1] A paraître, sous une forme un peu remaniée, dans *Helikon* 5, 1965. Sur les études classiques dans les universités voir en particulier A. Bartoněk, "Der Latein- und Griechischunterricht in der Tschechoslowakischen Sozialistischen Republik," *Romanitas* 4, 1962, 369-384.

lors peu de changements se sont produits mais tout de même certains problèmes se sont cristallisés, surtout depuis l'approbation définitive du projet d'introduire à nouveau le latin comme matière obligatoire ou facultative dans l'enseignement secondaire, malheureusement pour trois années seulement.[2]

On ne saurait trop insister sur l'intensité que devra avoir l'enseignement renouvelé du latin au cours de ces trois années qui précèdent les études à l'université. Il est nécessaire d'élaborer de nouveaux manuels, car ceux d'autrefois, destinés aux gymnases, supposaient plus qu'on ne peut exiger aujourd'hui, et ceux qui avaient été préparés pour l'enseignement facultatif de latin étaient trop peu exigeants et n'étaient pas sans fautes.[3] En ce qui concerne de nouvelles méthodes de l'enseignement, quelques expériences ont déjà été faites dans l'enseignement universitaire avec pour but d'apprendre aux étudiants le latin dans un minimum du temps: par exemple on a essayé d'apprendre toutes les conjugaisons à la fois.[4] A l'heure actuelle les élèves sortant de l'école secondaire connaissent quelque chose de la littérature et de la mythologie antique, mais leur connaissance le la langue est tout à fait insuffisante. Quant au grec, espérons qu'on réussira à l'introduire à nouveau dans un nombre restreint d'écoles, disons trois ou cinq.

En ce qui concerne les manuels pour l'enseignement de la littérature, des antiquités, etc. . . ., dans ces dernières douze années on n'en avait plus besoin dans les écoles secondaires, étant donné la restriction du latin. On pouvait employer aussi des manuels plus anciens, de même que les publications nouvelles destinées plutôt aux cours de l'université.[5] Maintenant, une équippe travaillant sous la direction de MM. L. Svoboda et L. Varcl est en train d'achever une petitie encyclopédie de l'antiquité classique, destinée aux étudiants et au public cultivé.

Il existe en outre un bon nombre de livres populaires dont quelques-uns ont été écrits spécialement pour la jeunesse et peuvent très bien être recommandés aux écoliers comme lectures complémentaires. Souvent d'ailleurs, il n'est pas besoin de recommander ces livres car ils sont très

[2] A partir de l'année 1965–1966 comme matière obligatoire dans la branche dite humaniste, soit 2+2+2 leçons par semaine, et comme facultative dans la branche des sciences, soit 0+2+2 leçons par semaine.

[3] Pour les écoles slovaques a été déjà élaboré un nouveau manuel du latin par MM. J. Špaňár et E. Kettner, qui correspond pleinement aux exigences nouvelles.

[4] Sur les nouvelles méthodes voir surtout un article en tchèque de M. A. Bartoněk, dans "Antická konference 1964" ("Conférence sur l'antiquité, 1964"), Praha, 1964, pp. 113–132, y compris la discussion.

[5] Comme la chrestomathie des auteurs et documents antiques traduits en tchèque, servant à l'enseignement de l'histoire aux étudiants qui ne sont pour la plupart plus capables d'étudier les sources dans la langue originale (*Antika v dokumentech I–II*, rédacteurs J. Nováková — J. Pečírka, Praha, 1959–1961).

vite épuisés. Parmi les auteurs de ces livres il y en a beaucoup qui ne sont pas des spécialistes; peut-être savent-ils écrire avec plus d'attrait que les philologues et archéologues eux-mêmes.

En ce qui concerne l'histoire ancienne, son enseignement dans les écoles secondaires a été entraîné dans la crise générale de l'enseignement de l'histoire. On a quelquefois trop insisté sur les luttes sociales au sein de la société esclavagiste, et en oubliant les évènements. Maintenant on en vient à discuter même ce schéma de l'évolution de la société, dans un débat ouvert par le sinologue T. Pokora et continué surtout dans la revue *Eirene*.

Il est tout naturel que nous soyons obligés de travailler avec des traductions, même à l'université. Nous sommes heureux d'avoir beaucoup de traductions vraiment modernes, et que d'autres ne cessent de paraître, surtout en Slovaquie qui doit à cet égard rattraper la culture tchèque. De même que les livres populaires, les traductions, surtout s'il s'agit de poésie ou de titres attrayants, sont épuisées en une seule journée. Il faudrait savoir si ceux qui achètent ces traductions si avidement le font par curiosité ou par une sorte de snobisme ou par un intérêt plus profond. C'est à cet effet que M^me^ R. Dostálová a commencé à organiser une enquête sociologique à l'aide des questionnaires insérés dans les traductions. Jusqu'à présent, on n'a reçu que les premières réponses. Néanmoins, on peut déjà constater que parmi les lecteurs sont représentées les professions les plus diverses et beaucoup de jeunes gens qui ont appris peu de choses sur l'antiquité à l'école et tout de même en soupçonnent les valeurs.

L. Vidman

FRANCE

Par rapport à ce qu'on dit ici pour quelques-uns des autres pays représentés à ce Colloque, la situation des études classiques en France inspire un optimisme mesuré, car elles y gardent un très large prestige. Nous avons maintenant en France deux enseignements du Second Degré: d'une part les Lycées, qui sont les anciens lycées traditionnels plus ou moins bien adaptés à l'enseignement de masse qu'ils doivent désormais donner, d'autre part les Collèges d'Enseignement Général (C. E. G.) et les Collèges d'Enseignement Secondaire (C. E. S.), qui ne diffèrent pratiquement entre eux que par leur nom: les uns et les autres sont issus des anciens cours complémentaires qui complétaient l'enseignement primaire pour les élèves qui ne passaient pas dans l'enseignement secondaire.

Les Lycées actuels conservent la vieille tradition des lycées napoléoniens qui remonte en fait aux collèges de Jésuites du XVII^e^ et du XVIII^e^ siécle. Leurs professeurs ont été formés en facultés, ils possèdent

la licence ou le Certificat d'Aptitude Pédagogique à l'Enseignement du Second Degré (C. A. P. E. S.) ou l'agrégation. Les innombrables "réformes de l'enseignement" qui les ont affectés depuis le début de ce siècle n'ont jamais été en réalité que des réformes de détail sans grande importance au total. Les études classiques y relèvent à la fois de l'enseignement de l'histoire et de l'enseignement des lettres. L'histoire ancienne (Egypte, Orient, Grèce et Rome) est enseignée dans les petites classes (6e et 5e, enfants de 12 à 13 ans environ); parfois les programmes l'ont fait réapparaître d'une façon plus ou moins partielle dans les grandes classes. C'est ainsi que le nouveau programme d'histoire qui entre actuellement en application prévoit que la civilisation de la Grèce et la civilisation de Rome seront examinées à nouveau en seconde (15-16 ans); cet enseignement de l'histoire est commun à toutes les sections, qu'elles soient avec ou sans latin. Il existe en effet des sections avec latin et des sections sans latin, mais il faut souligner que les sections sans latin sont considérées comme des sections d'un niveau inférieur, ceci moins par les professeurs que par les parents et par les élèves eux-mêmes. Une certaine évolution se produit à cet égard à la suite d'arrivée dans les lycées d'élèves venant de nouvelles couches sociales, mais elle reste faible parce que le latin demeure pour l'ensemble de l'opinion le véritable critère des études secondaires. La réforme actuellement en cours, qui supprime la première partie du baccalauréat, n'apportera aucun changement à cet égard. Il faut reconnaître par contre que l'enseignement du grec n'est plus suivi aujourd'hui que par un très petit nombre d'élèves, parce qu'il paraît ne conduire à aucune autre carrière qu'à celle de l'enseignement des Lettres: cependant cet enseignement connaît en ce moment un léger regain de faveur.

Le personnel enseignant des C. E. G. est constitué par des instituteurs qui sont titulaires du baccalauréat mais dont la plupart n'ont jamais fait de latin et ne peuvent pas l'enseigner. Ces C. E. G., qui conduisent leurs élèves jusqu'à la Seconde, ont les mêmes programmes d'histoire que les lycées, par conséquent l'histoire ancienne y est enseignée dans les mêmes classes (6e et 5e), mais par des professeurs qui ne sont jamais des spécialistes. En général dans les C. E. G. on n'enseigne pas le latin, puisque les professeurs n'ont pas fait les études nécessaires pour le faire. Il faut noter cependant une évolution extrêmement intéressante et prometteuse. D'abord, certains professeurs de C. E. G. viennent compléter leurs études en facultés en cherchant au moins à y acquérir une licence partielle, d'autre part dans certains C. E. G., pour lesquels on a pu trouver des maîtres plus ou moins qualifiés, on commence à enseigner le latin, et il est vraisemblable que ce mouvement ira en s'amplifiant, toujours pour la même raison: il n'est pas aux yeux de l'opinion française d'études secondaires valables sans latin.

Il faut reconnaître cependant que l'enseignement des langues anciennes, du latin en particulier, même dans les lycées, n'est plus aujourd'hui ce qu'il était autrefois. D'abord parce que les enseignements du second degré en France ont été submergés par le nombre. Cette situation avait commencé à se manifester avant la guerre, lorsque l'enseignement secondaire était devenu gratuit, et le phénomène s'est amplifié depuis la guerre par suite de l'évolution démographique et parce que des familles de plus en plus nombreuses ont voulu faire accéder leurs enfants à l'enseignement secondaire. It est dû, évidemment aussi, comme partout, aux conditions de la vie moderne, au développement des enseignements scientifiques aux dépens des enseignements littéraires qu'elle impose, et plus encore sans doute à la dispersion de l'attention des enfants qu'elle provoque. Je ne saurais trop dire, pour ma part, qu'elle est dû surtout au médiocre résultat de l'enseignement: en effet, les élèves qui quittent le lycée après six ans de latin et quatre ans de grec sont incapables de comprendre le texte le plus court et le plus simple, parce que l'enseignement des langues mortes est en France essentiellement un enseignement de la grammaire et oublie à peu près complètement le vocabulaire.

Optimisme mesuré donc, mais ce que nous perdons du côté de l'enseignement nous le retrouvons dans une large mesure du côté des adultes, qui témoignent d'un intérêt de plus en plus grand pour l'antiquité et en particulier pour l'archéologie. Le prouvent le succès des ouvrages consacrés à l'art antique, le nombre de plus en plus grand des touristes français qui vont visiter les sites antiques en Italie et en Grèce, le prouve enfin d'une façon particulièrement effective la multiplication des groupes d'amateurs qui se livrent en France même à des fouilles archéologiques extrêmement sérieuses. Cet intérêt constitue pour nous le meilleur encouragement que nous puissions recevoir à continuer à défendre les études classiques, car il prouve que, contrairement à ce que l'on pense trop souvent, nous ne sommes pas du tout coupés de nos contemporains.

J. LeGall

GERMANY

In Germany the problem of the Classics as a medium of education, as discussed by the Colloquium, arises only in the sphere of secondary education, because at the university level Classics are taken as professional training rather than for general education. There are three types of grammar schools in Germany. Each of them has a nine-year curriculum leading to a final examination (the "Abitur") which qualifies the student to enter any university without an additional test. One of the three types of school is based especially on modern languages, the

second on mathematics and sciences, and the third (the traditional "Gymnasium," now "altsprachliches Gymnasium") on the Classics. Up to now Greek has been taught to about eight per cent of all secondary-school pupils, for six years and in schools of the third type only, while Latin has been taught to about forty per cent and in all three types, in amounts varying from three to six and nine years.

Next year or the year after, however, Greek will be reduced from six to five years in the *Gymnasium*. Although this measure actually affects only eight per cent of all pupils, the reason for it seems to reflect the general situation. Since all the schools prepare for the same academic qualification, the *Abitur*, their curricula have to be quite strictly parallel and a pupil's transfer from one type to the other should be made as easy as possible, at least during the first three or four years. Consequently the third and last language in the particular curriculum should begin not earlier than the fifth year, as has been customary in schools of type one and two, whereas Greek, being a difficult language, was begun in the fourth year according to the traditional pattern of studies in the *Gymnasium*.

The same tendency to maintain a similar and equivalent curriculum in all three types of school prevents the schools from specializing, even in the last two grades when the pupils are 18 and 19 years old and have reached a level comparable to the first two years of college in the United States. In addition to the Classics, considerable amounts of mathematics, sciences, and of course modern languages are taught throughout the curriculum. Thus specialization in the proper sense of the word is aimed at, and occasionally achieved, only in extra classes. Hence the results of so many years of study of Greek and Latin are often unsatisfactory and yield easy arguments to the opponents of classical education.

There are two main lines of opposition. The representatives of the first one rely on somewhat old-fashioned arguments, according to which only the sciences and modern languages furnish an adequate medium of education in a modern industrialized society. The other group are much more sophisticated. They fully acknowledge the increasing importance of the classical tradition in modern literature and philosophy. But they argue that classical education in its traditional guise, that is to say, based mainly on the study of the two ancient languages, fails to realize the essential values of Greek and Roman civilization; that a much more promising approach to it would be through European literature (because of its classical heritage), Greek art and its imitations, Roman history, Roman law, and the like. This opinion is widely held among men of letters and so-called experts in

the field of Education. It should be added, however, that classical education in its traditional form is still advocated by distinguished scientists and influential business men.

Albrecht Dihle

GHANA

Education has undergone a tremendous and spectacular growth in Ghana during the last three decades of this century, largely as a result of the 2nd World War, nationalism, and political changes. We have reached the stage, today, where Ghana has three university institutions and a total university enrolment of over 4,500 (in a population of 7 million).

Yet the roots of formal western-type education, especially in the coastal area of the country, which has had contacts with Europe since the 15th century, go back to the beginning of the 19th century, when as a result of European trading and missionary activities a number of primary and middle schools were established with a strong missionary and clerical bias.

It was inevitable that during the latter part of the 19th century, when secondary education developed, the curriculum adopted should be closely patterned on that obtaining in Europe, and the study of the Classics should take pride of place. Latin was (and is still almost) universal in all secondary schools, Greek in a few of the better ones. There is even one secondary school where Greek plays in the original used to be regularly and successfully performed for a long period.

However, with the foundation of Achimota College in 1927 the emphasis began to shift to science, mathematics, and African history, languages and culture. Yet even as recently as 1958, when the University of Ghana was still in special relation with London University and was offering London degrees, Latin was required for entrance into the University of Ghana!

Today, the situation has very significantly changed. Inevitably, in the period of 'decolonisation' and the post-independence reëvaluation of our educational system, the need to redress the balance in favour of science and technology, to 'decolonise' and 'Africanise' the school curriculum, has led to considerable recession in classical studies in the secondary schools and the University. This is reflected in the very small number of schools which now offer Greek and a very considerable decrease in the quantity and quality of Latin scholars now entering the University of Ghana, as compared for example with 6 years ago when the University was in special relation with London University. At that time, the classics curriculum with minor variations (and im-

provements) was identical with the London University syllabus — complete with prose compositions, etc.

Faced with this recession, we in the Classics Department of the University of Ghana have had to rethink and modify our previous Olympian standards, and have now introduced a more flexible and integrated degree programme of Joint-Honours (Latin and/or Greek, in combination with modern languages, English, linguistics, history, philosophy, etc.). We have also started a beginners' Greek course, and substituted retranslation for prose composition in the first year of the B.A. General Degree course. In general, our aim has been to throw our net much wider and to place greater emphasis on the *content* of the Classics as a civilisation rather than as an elegant foreign tradition.

Thus our main effort is now directed to stressing the philosophical, historical, literary and linguistic perspectives and the cultural insights that the Classics do provide, and to emphasise their seminal importance for much of 20th century civilisation. We concede, naturally, that the accent in Africa today must rightly be on 'Africanisation'; on the re-interpretation of the African environment, past and present; and on the scientific and technological revolution so essential for rapid modernisation of all the developing countries. We do insist, however, on the relevance to modern life of all the humanities — African or European, 'Western' or 'Eastern'. If the Classics are truly concerned with a vital fragment of human history, then it is essential that we in Africa have direct experience of them in the most meaningful way, and not come to them only by derivative or second-hand experience.

Thus we hope by our modified approach to cater to the specialist classicists and also to provide as broad a general education as we can for the rest. And for our specialist Honours students we have provided a popular special subject — 'Africa in the Classical World', which we hope will give an additional local flavour. So we are reasonably optimistic.

A. A. Kwapong

GREAT BRITAIN

At the university level, the majority of teachers can still take things fairly comfortably. Though the percentage of Classics students has declined, university expansion has meant that absolute numbers have remained fairly steady and standards have not noticeably declined. Reform is in the air, but it is dedicated to doing more and different things with the students available; to cut down prose composition to make room for things more interesting to the teachers, many of which, though by no means all, are also educationally more stimulating than prose composition; and to open up new possibilities of collaboration with other subjects.

The schools, on the other hand, have active battles on their hands. Even within the old academic grammar-school framework, covering not more than 20% of an age-group, Classics teachers are being forced to fight for pupils and justify the value of their subject, and thereby to find more acceptable and profitable ways of teaching it. But this framework is rapidly breaking down; in the new comprehensive systems all specialisation is likely to be deferred and school time for Latin, not to say Greek, will become shorter and shorter. Problems of how to present something of the ancient world to those without the languages, which have really never been seriously considered at England at any level, are becoming more urgent.

The universities cannot long remain untouched, and their supply of well-trained pupils is bound to diminish. This presents a special problem for the Classics, in view of the entrenched position of specialist degrees in England and the extreme rarity of general courses. If elementary language teaching has to be incorporated in Classics courses, their standard will inevitably drop. I do not myself believe that the pattern of specialist courses will endure indefinitely, but they have a long life in front of them yet. It would not be unsafe to predict that Classics is in for a hard time from, say, 1975 to 1990, and if it reëmerges after 1990 it will be in a very different form.

To meet the crisis, English Classics teaching has some notable advantages which hardly exist elsewhere: a strong block of classically trained men in high places, a much stronger tradition than in the U. S. of communication between the university and the school, and a nucleus of professionals whose job it has always been to think about the teaching of Classics and not just teaching or just Classics. JACT has got off to a good start because of these professionals and the not inconsiderable number of highly intelligent teachers in the schools who care about their subject. The universities are beginning to take notice and start thinking; they will have to, or they will have nothing left to do.

David M. Lewis

GREECE

The teaching of Classics in my homeland is a matter of great importance, not only because of tradition but also because of the responsibility for maintaining our great heritage, of which we are conscious. That is why in the case of Greece one must take various methods of teaching the ancient texts into consideration as the living proof of our great interest in this subject.

Until the present time, ancient Greek was taught for more than ten hours a week in all secondary school classes and Latin was included in the syllabus from the fourth grade onward. However, neither the

method nor the syllabus corresponded to modern-day requirements; hence the last government endeavored conscientiously and sincerely to launch a new, vigorous program for the teaching of the classical authors. But this program was not acceptable in all its parts. It has two principal defects: 1) teaching of the Classics through modern translations in the first three classes, and 2) the complete abolition of Latin.

However, in Greece, it is not only the secondary school that concerns itself with classical education. A considerable number of our theatrical groups are designed to act ancient plays; many scientific societies and other organizations also contribute to the aim, with conferences, publications, excursions to archeological sites, etc. All this helps to spread knowledge of our ancient civilization to a large public within the country.

Interest in classical studies in Greece reveals itself in the fact that the number of students studying literature is as large as that of the medical or law faculties in the Universities. Although the syllabus is overloaded, its standard is by no means inferior to that prevailing in other European countries. The Greek student who will eventually teach in secondary schools must have a thorough knowledge of all subjects appertaining to the ancient world, such as philosophy, history, archaeology, psychology, etc.

Recognizing our faults, we are also aware that we have not rid ourselves of the consequences of the last war, and as I have already emphasized, we are at this very moment undergoing a reform. Since the beginning of 1964 Greece has a third faculty of literature, in Yannina (Epirus), and we hope soon to have a fourth. Then the old faculties will be relieved of a number of students, the student will be able to choose his preferred faculty, the teaching program will be enlarged, a university career will be within easier reach, and classical education will become more general.

N. Livadaras

ITALY

Come già indicai a Philadelphia, nella mia relazione dello scorso anno (1964), la situazione degli studi classici in Italia, per la dilatata dimensione delle loro ultime vicende, ha un chiaro valore indicativo.

Per iniziativa del passato regime, di cui sono noti i miti classicistici, l'insegnamento del latino fu imposto, prima della guerra, praticamente a tutti gli italiani: un provvedimento totalitario, che svalutò rapidamente i contenuti essenziali delle nostre discipline, formalizzandole (con il trionfo di grammatiche e grammatichette) o esteriorizzandole (*latin vivant* e simili). Reazione contraria si è avuta, di necessità, alla fine della guerra: nuovi estremismi pretendono l'abolizione totale

del latino (almeno dalla scuola dell' obbligo, dagli 11 ai 14 anni), rivendicano una cultura non più pretensiosamente umanistica, ma moderna, tecnologica. Si è venuti ad un primo compromesso, per cui il latino nella detta scuola è materia opzionale, ma insegnata non come fine a se stesso, sebbene in relazione con l'italiano (presunto suo figlio primogenito). La battaglia del latino non solo è perduta su questo piano, ma, evidentemente smarrita la coscienza delle sue intrinseche finalità, appare disperata anche negli altri livelli. Sembra imminente infatti un nuovo compromesso: alla scuola dell' obbligo seguirebbero non solo un Liceo Classico (con lo smilzo e pappagallesco latino oggi in uso), ma un Liceo Scientifico, un altro Pedagogico, un altro ancora Linguistico. Tutti con il latino: un latino ovviamente edulcorato, un ambizioso paramento.

Il futuro delle discipline classiche (le vicende del greco sono ancillarmente legate a quelle del latino) non sembra si possa difendere espandendole e nello stesso tempo invilendole: un Liceo opzionale, di impostazione moderna e non confusamente enciclopedico come l'attuale, uguale per tutti, ma con le due discipline classiche facoltative, assicurerebbe latino e greco soltanto a quanti hanno interesse e fiducia, ma permetterebbe di insegnare le due "lingue" totalitariamente, con ampiezza e dedizione assoluta. Il contributo dei "classici", sul piano della diffusione orizzontale e cioè culturale, è da lungo tempo inflazionato, non solo in Italia. È necessaria una rimeditazione particolare, in profondità, affidata ai singoli: l'avvenire dei classici è nel loro progresso quale disciplina scientifica, non quale appannaggio popolare o demagogico. L'esempio dell' Italia appare indicativo, come dicevo: rettoriche sentimentali e presuntuose andrebbero finalmente abbandonate, si impongono coraggiose restrizioni, una onesta regola. Programmi deflazionistici risultano notoriamente più economici ed efficaci.

Benedetto Marzullo

JAPAN

Ce que représente chez nous l'étude des classiques de l'antiquité grecque ou latine, c'est vraisemblablement ce que représente l'Orientalisme dans les pays de civilisation européenne. En fait, l'enseignement des langues classiques d'Occident n'existe pas dans les écoles secondaires du Japon, et reste en marge du programme dans les universités. Mais nous avons déjà, à Tokyo et à Kyoto, une vingtaine d'étudiants qui travaillent sur le grec et le latin pour une licence ès lettres (B. A.) ainsi que pour une maîtrise ès lettres (M. A.).

Ce qui nous paraît plus important, c'est que nous avons des cours très suivis ces dernières années, surtout à partir des Jeux Olympiques à Tokyo en 1964, qui sont destinés aux étudiants de la Faculté des Arts

Libéraux (Department of General Education). Ces cours sont conçus comme introduction à la civilisation de l'antiquité occidentale, utilisant largement les traductions des grands auteurs (notamment Homère et Platon).

Étant donné que nos professeurs ne peuvent pas demander une connaissance réelle des langues classiques à la quasi-totalité des étudiants, il serait très utile de publier une petite série de rapports, en langue japonaise, sur la longue tradition culturelle de l'Occident. A ce point de vue, nous tenons à signaler les activités du *Groupe du théâtre antique de l'Université de Tokyo*, qui sous la direction du Docteur M. Kubo représente successivement depuis huit ans des tragédies de Sophocle et d'Euripide dans un théâtre en plein air au centre de Tokyo, devant cinq mille spectateurs.

Ainsi commence à se former un public éclairé qui s'intéresse aux classiques d'Occident, et qui trouve qu'il serait nécessaire de lire les oeuvres de l'antiquité pour mieux comprendre les langues et les littératures modernes. C'est bien la base sur laquelle on peut espérer la possibilité d'encourager sérieusement les études des classiques grecs et latins, qui sont d'ailleurs très difficiles à poursuivre dans un pays d'Extrême-Orient, où l'on se donne déjà pas mal de peine pour apprendre une langue vivante de l'Occident.

T. Tobari

THE NETHERLANDS

In our secondary education we have three types of schools: 1) Gymnasium; 2) Lyceum; 3) H. B. S.: *H*(ogere) *B*(urger) *S*(chool). It is only in the first two types that Latin, Greek and Ancient History are taught. Here the number of hours devoted to these subjects is comparatively large. Moreover the subject is compulsory; so far we have no optional subjects in our secondary schools.

In the Gymnasium ("grammar school") the pupils take Latin from the very beginning. In the second form Greek is added. After the fourth form the pupils are supposed to choose between the so-called A section and the B section. In the A section (fifth and sixth form) emphasis is laid upon the Classics (30–40%), modern languages (French, German, English, Dutch), and history; some attention is also paid to mathematics (2–3 hours a week), and "select topics" from statistics or biology are also a distinct possibility. In the B section the programme is very heavy. It consists of mathematics, chemistry, physics, biology (on an advanced level, at least in comparison with the little bit of mathematics that the A pupils have to face), modern languages (see A section), and Classics (Latin *and* Greek, though on a slightly lower level, both qualitatively and quantitatively, than the A candidates).

The Lyceum always has a "gymnasium" section, with the same program as the Gymnasium proper; the only difference is that the first form of a Lyceum offers a general program (modern languages, mathematics, history, biology) for all pupils. At the end of this form they choose between the gymnasium section and the H. B. S. section; accordingly classical education starts one year later here than in the Gymnasium.

At the moment there is a tendency (a) to restrict the admittedly considerable number of hours devoted to Classics, and (b) to solve the "problem" of the B section, e.g., by making Greek an optional subject, with the distinct and desirable possibility of concentrating solely upon Latin. Perhaps this change will enable us to give the pupils more insight into Latin culture, whereas at the moment grammatical training (or rather drill) is the prevailing phenomenon.

Generally speaking — and I consider this a salutary phenomenon — Dutch classicists are being compelled by recent government proposals concerning the reform of secondary education to ask themselves what the objective of classical training is. So far, in practice, the approach has been traditional: "Classics have been studied since the Renaissance; we are continuing this tradition." At present we have to face the crucial question: "What does 'classical' mean in our 20th century, which to say the least shows a startling discontinuity with the past?" Perhaps we shall have to adapt our reading program drastically to this situation.

H. W. Pleket

SPAIN

La situation des études classiques en Espagne, vis-à-vis du pessimisme qu'on décèle partout, n'est pas trop inquiétante. Même je dirais qu'elle est assez satisfaisante. Dans l'enseignement secondaire on a depuis une dizaine d'années abandonné l'ancien système (plan d'études de 1938) dans lequel les élèves avaient 7 cours (années) de latin et 3 cours de grec obligatoires pour tous, pour établir un nouveau plan d'études (1953) avec 2 ans de latin obligatoire pour tous (Brevet élémentaire) et 3 ans de latin et de grec pour ceux qui suivent le 2e cycle dans la branche littéraire. Les bons résultats acquis par cette mesure sont évidents, surtout dans la dernière année (cours préuniversitaire), où on a essayé avec succès l'étude monographique d'un seul auteur (par exemple Platon-Cicéron, Homère-Virgile). Le niveau est relativement bon dans les centres de l'État, mais malheureusement, sauf exceptions, n'arrive pas toujours à son but dans les centres privés (80% de l'enseignement secondaire) par manque de professeurs spécialisés. C'est pour cela que l'État a établi dans certains lycées d'enseignement secondaire des sémi-

naires didactiques sous la direction du titulaire de la chaire, un centre d'orientation didactique, et des cours de perfectionnement pour les professeurs des centres privés.

Dans toutes les Facultés de Lettres, il y a 2 ans de latin obligatoires pour tous les étudiants et 2 ans de grec optionel dans la première période (propédeutique). Le premier degré une fois fini on choisit la specialité, qui dure 3 ans. A ce moment il y a une section de philologie classique dans les universités de Salamanque, Barcelonne et Madrid, dont le nombre des élèves s'est triplé dans les trois dernières années. C'est pourquoi on a créé l'année dernière une nouvelle section de philologie classique à Grenade. Il va de soi que dans les Universités de l'Église (Salamanque, Comillas, Pampeluna) il y a aussi des chaires de latin et de grec.

Si dans certains milieux de la societé espagnole — disons le grand public — on perçoit une evidente hostilité à l'égard des études classiques ("le latin c'est bon pour les curés," disaient déjà les anticléricaux de notre XIX^{e} siècle), l'État jusqu'à présent les a encouragés, ou au moins s'est montré neutral dans les polémiques que les journaux soulèvent parfois (presque toujours après la publication des résultats inquiétants des examens) contre l'étude du grec et du latin dans l'enseignement secondaire, dont l'efficacité à leur avis doit être seulement celle de faire obstacle au développement normal de l'éducation des jeunes gens. Malgré tout, la connaissance du latin et surtout du grec jouit d'un certain prestige dans les cercles intellectuels, spécialement chez les essayistes qui, en dépit de leur ignorance, multiplient dans leurs oeuvres les citations classiques et les étymologies grécissantes. Et paradoxalement ce sont eux, et non la "Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos" ou le "Instituto Antonio de Nebrija" de notre Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, qui sont les meilleurs défenseurs des langues classiques.

L. Gil

SWEDEN

Up to now, Greek and Latin have been taught in the Swedish *gymnasium* for 2 and 4 years respectively. Of the perhaps 15 to 20 per cent of the population who attend this advanced school from age 15 to 19, about one in three has chosen the branch including Latin, and perhaps one in forty has also chosen Greek.

However, a far-reaching reform of the *gymnasium* has been decided and will soon go into effect. So far as the classical languages are concerned, they will be all but abolished. Latin will be taught for two years only, for 7 hours a week. Further, the new system will be implemented in such a way that it can be foreseen that less than 10 per cent of the students in the *gymnasium* will choose this language.

The possibility of studying Greek will hardly be more than theoretical. If it is realized, this language will be studied for 4 hours a week during the same two years as Latin is taught.

In this situation, the vast majority of students will be brought into contact with classical civilization only through the limited instruction in the subjects of History and Literature. In the future, those interested in the dissemination of the Classics will have to concentrate on trying to make this instruction as adequate and as attractive as possible.

On the university level, intensive elementary courses in both languages already exist and will obviously be ever more important. Concerning the future of scholarly studies, there does not seem to be any reason to despair. The base for recruitment will be narrowed; but if the subjects are reasonably well taught at the secondary and university levels, it ought not to be very difficult to attract a small number of very good students to fill the small number of academic positions available.

Tore Janson

THE UNITED STATES: EAST

The situation of classical studies in the United States is mildly optimistic, not so much because of any increased appeal of the languages themselves, but because more and more teachers of the Classics are becoming salesmen for their subject. The day is past when a young man was required to have a reading knowledge of Latin or Greek in order to be equipped with the common marks of gentility, or to be admitted to college. Compulsion has been almost completely abolished. If Latin and Greek are demanded, it is because a student has chosen to pursue a major which requires a knowledge of these two languages, e.g., theology or comparative literature. The removal of the "classics requirement" for college admission has had important consequences.

First, the high schools have begun to regard training in Latin and Greek as a frill. State departments of education have maintained — under prodding and pressure — two years of language training. But it is only with extreme difficulty that teachers are allowed to continue with a third year or beyond. There is no lack of interest from students; students are there in ample numbers. And teachers are willing. However, there is a breakdown in the administrative system. In Pennsylvania the Department of Public Instruction is now willing to be persuaded that there is a need for third- and fourth-year training. Associations of classical teachers are mobilizing to explain this to government agencies. But by themselves they are not strong. They need statistical studies and expressions of broadly based opinion from other supporting bodies. The modern languages have these materials; the ancient languages are

compiling them rather slowly. It should be said that there are some private schools — though they are few — where the standards in ancient languages are still very high.

I have said that many teachers in high schools have stimulated interest in classics among students. However, there are not enough of these teachers. Their training must be improved. Too many teachers are proficient in theories of education but too poorly trained in Latin or Greek to be able to teach their subject adequately. And such teachers only lose the interest of their students.

The breakdown at the secondary-school level has meant a drop in the number of prepared students who come to college. Increasingly it has become the job of the college to train incoming students in the rudiments of Latin — not to mention Greek — before it can responsibly accept them as majors. Often this interest comes late in the student's college career, and here is a consequent need for methods of teaching both languages quickly so that the student can begin reading as soon as possible. There are summer sessions in various colleges which give introductory courses, but there is need for special institutes experimenting with new methods. Also, colleges have almost a duty to introduce their students to classical civilization courses which may interest potential majors. Such courses should be given in the freshman year so that there is time to have prospective students begin learning the languages.

These are tasks to be done. I hope that such groups as the Colloquium can aid in the formation of educated opinion about the future of Classics. Students are interested, teachers are dedicated, and educational committees are concerned. Now there is need for some solid thinking about our place and role in education, and a need for disseminating our thoughts. The next large moves in education will come from government, and if government moves in an informed fashion, Classics can have a significant role in the new system. Our task is to convince government officials that we should have that chance.

William C. Scott
Haverford College (Pennsylvania)

THE UNITED STATES: WEST

I teach at the largest state university in California, where more than 25,000 students gather for the most various kinds of education. Of those many students, the Classics Department at Berkeley affects about 1500 each year. At least half of that 1500, probably considerably more, cannot read a word of Greek or Latin. However, to give them some awareness of ancient literature and civilization, we offer courses

in archaeology, history, and classical literature that have in many cases proved highly valuable to individual students. These are what we call "service" courses, but we recognize their importance sufficiently to devote considerable time to them. In the United States we have long faced the plain fact that barring from the Greek and Roman classics all those who cannot read the original languages is not only inexcusable but suicidal. Therefore it is not without self-interest that we have become engaged in what once was regarded as peripheral teaching.

Most American universities, state and private, award a general Bachelor's degree in Science or Humanities. To earn this degree a student must complete a certain number of courses in a broad field, then concentrate in depth in a major subject. Among the "breadth requirements" is one that demands reading ability in at least one foreign language, ancient or modern. We find that we get a considerable number of students, in Latin and secondarily in Greek, who are merely taking the three semesters of work to complete this "language requirement." For them and for others who are genuinely interested at this late stage in the Classical languages, we offer elementary training in Greek and Latin. [One of our eminent professors met his first class this morning and discovered 50 people who desired to learn first-year Greek.] Although our training is fairly rigorous, we aim to develop the ability to read as soon as possible, and accordingly it is possible, and it has happened more than once in my experience, that a student starts his Latin and Greek at the university but still, by careful planning, succeeds in making one or both his major subject. We naturally do not have a large number who specialize in the Classical languages. I should think that approximately 10 Bachelor's degrees per year are awarded to "majors" in Classics.

However, besides teaching elementary language courses and rudimentary literary studies of Vergil, Horace, Plato, and the like, I and my colleagues work with graduate students in seminars and research. There are over 30 men and women here at Berkeley studying Classical Philology, and about 10 more concentrating in Classical Archaeology. These students we train carefully and lovingly for the Ph.D., knowing that they will be our successors, to promote or ruin the Classics in our country. I have a very high opinion of many of them, and I personally feel quite optimistic about the state of the Classics in American universities.

It is when one regards the secondary schools that a mood of pessimism is hard to resist. I enjoy the varied teaching duties that come my way (a Vergil course, a graduate course in the *Metamorphoses*, and a lecture series on Classical civilization in one semester, for example). But if I were obliged to teach elementary Latin under trying circum-

stances, like our secondary teachers, I probably should feel as defeated as they do. Greek is taught nowhere in California, so far as I know, before the university; Latin is available, from one to four years depending on the school. Most Latin teachers are on the defensive because the cult of practicality is particularly strong on the secondary level, and nobody should presume to argue the merits of Latin on such meretricious terms. I know of many individual successes among such teachers, but they are always striking just because they are not the general rule. We in the universities can help our colleagues in the schools, and we should. All too often, though, we allow ourselves to become isolated in the peaceful climate of the academy and refuse to soil ourselves with the menial worries and confusing politics of the schools. It seems to me that if we are honestly dedicated to the Classics we must see that our responsibility pulls us out into the world. In isolation the Classics are worthless, as our enemies have long ago quite correctly asserted.

W. S. Anderson
University of California at Berkeley

V. ROSTER: THE MEMBERS OF THE COLLOQUIUM

Mailing address, where different from title and institution, is given in indented position.

Asterisk (*) indicates attendance at the London meeting.

William S. Anderson (U. S. A.)*
Associate Professor of Latin
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley 4, California

B. Bernabé Navarro (Mexico)
Profesor de Filosofía, y Secretario, Centro de Estudios Filosoficos
Universidade de Mexico
Centro de Estudíos Filosoficos
Torre de Humanidade, 4o. piso
Ciudad Universitaria
Mexico 20, D. F., Mexico

Ulpiano T. Bezerra de Meneses (Brazil)*
Professor-assistente de Cadeira de História Antiga e Medieval, encarregado do Curso de Arqueologia
Departamento de História da Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras da Universidade de São Paulo.
Rua Genebra—Apt. 181
São Paulo
Brazil

Glenn W. Bowersock (U. S. A.)*
Assistant Professor of the Classics
Harvard University
318 Boylston Hall
Cambridge 38, Mass.

Winfried Bühler (Germany)
Privatdozent
Universität München
8 München 13
Stauffenbergstrasse 7/VIII
West Germany

Theodore V. Buttrey (U. S. A.)
Associate Professor, Dept. of Classical Studies
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Aldo Caselli
Business Manager
Gallaudet College
Washington, D.C.
(formerly Haverford College)

Mortimer Chambers (U. S. A.)
Associate Professor of History
University of California, Los Angeles
Department of History
University of California
Los Angeles 24, California

Marvin Colker (U. S. A.)
Associate Professor of Classics and Chairman of the Department of Classics
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Howard Comfort (U. S. A.)
Professor of Classics
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania

W. Robert Connor (U. S. A.)*
Assistant Professor of Classics
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Albrecht Dihle (Germany)
Professor
Universität zu Köln
(Harvard University, fall term 1965–66)
Köln-Marienburg
Schillingsrotterplatz 7
West Germany

Donald C. Earl (Great Britain)
Lecturer in Ancient History
The University, Leeds 2, England
(Northwestern University, 1965–66)

Edmonson, Colin N. (U. S. A.)*
Associate Professor of Ancient History
Department of Classics
University of Washington
Seattle 25, Washington

Gerald F. Else (Chairman) (U. S. A.)*
Professor of Greek and Latin and Chairman of the Department of Classical Studies
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Luis Gil (Spain)*
Catedrático de Filologia Griega
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Universidad de Salamanca
Toribio Pollan 2
Madrid 16, Spain

John Arthur Hanson (U. S. A.)*
Associate Professor of Classics
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

R. Ross Holloway (U. S. A.)*
Assistant Professor of Classical Archaeology
Brown University
Providence 12, Rhode Island

Tore Janson (Sweden, U. S. A.)*
Assistant Professor of Mediaeval Latin
University of California, Los Angeles
(formerly Stockholms Universitet, Sweden)
405 Wilgard Avenue
Los Angeles 24, California

Donald Kagan (U. S. A.)*
Associate Professor of Ancient History
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Brother David Hilary Kelly (U. S. A.)*
Assistant Professor, La Salle College
St. Joseph Hall, 1375 Ashbourne Road
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

George A. Kennedy (U. S. A.)
Professor and Chairman of the Department of Classics
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
(formerly Haverford College)

Alexander A. Kwapong (Ghana)*
Professor and Head, Department of Classics, and Dean of the Faculty of Arts
University of Ghana
Legon, Ghana

LeGall, Joël (France)*
Professeur d'histoire de l'antiquité
Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines
Université de Dijon
10, Rue Vauban
Dijon (Côte d' Or)

David M. Lewis (Great Britain)*
Tutor in Ancient History
Christ Church, Oxford, England

Nicholas A. Livadaras (Greece)*
Assistant Professor
University of Athens
40, Amalias
N. Iraklion, Greece

Benedetto Marzullo (Italy)*
Professore dï letteratura greca
Università di Cagliari
Via Niccolò Piccinni, 51
Rome, Italy

H. W. Pleket (The Netherlands) *
Wetenschappelijk Hoofdambtenaar voor Oude Geschiedenis en Griekse Epigrafiek
Rijksuniversiteit Leiden
Mozartstraat 201
Leiden, Holland

Michael C. J. Putnam (Chairman, Interim Committee) (U. S. A.) *
Associate Professor of Greek and Latin
Brown University
Providence 12, Rhode Island

Kenneth Quinn (New Zealand) *
Professor of Classics
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand
(formerly University of Melbourne, Australia)

Margaret E. Reesor (Canada)
Associate Professor of Classics
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

W. J. Niall Rudd (Canada)
Associate Professor of Classics
University College, Toronto

William C. Scott (Corresponding Secretary) (U. S. A.) *
Assistant Professor of Classics
Haverford College
Haverford, Pennsylvania

Tomoo Tobari (Japan) *
Associate Professor
Faculty of Letters, Chûô University, Tokyo
61 Higashi–Tamagawa
Setagaya
Tokyo, Japan

Ladislav Vidman (Czechoslovakia) *
Ph.Dr., C.Sc., Travailleur Scientifique, Chef de la section de l'Antiquité
Académie Tchécoslovaque des Sciences, Cabinet des études grecques, romaines et latines
Kafkova 51
Praha 6–Dejvice
Czechoslovakia